

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

JUNE, 1825.

*THE LIFE OF JOHN ROGERS *,*

THE PROTOMARTYR, 1555.

JOHN ROGERS was educated at the University of Cambridge, where he continued to reside, devoted to the acquisition of learning, until he was appointed Chaplain at Antwerp, by the Company of Merchants Adventurers. While at Antwerp, he became acquainted with William Tindal and Miles Coverdale, both at that time exiles from their country on account of religion. By conversation with these distinguished men, his mind was enlightened to see the errors and corruptions of the Papal Church, and he embraced the principles of the Reformation. He then engaged, in co-operation with them, in the noble work which they had undertaken, of translating the Bible into English. This work was the translation afterwards published under the title of "The Translation of Thomas Matthew."

Upon this change of his opinions, he resigned his chaplaincy at Antwerp; for, having married, he went to Wittenberg, in Saxony, and there prosecuted his theological studies. At the same time, he cultivated an acquaintance with the Dutch language, and was so great a proficient in it, that the charge of a Dutch congregation was committed to him.

He remained many years in the faithful discharge of this last office, until the accession of Edward VI. made an opening for his return to the enjoyment of religious freedom in his own country. It was not long before his zealous conduct brought him into the notice of Ridley, then Bishop of London, who gave him a Prebend in St. Paul's. The Dean and Chapter of that Church also appointed him the Reader of the Divinity Lecture there.

So long as Edward was on the throne, Rogers held these situations in the Church, and was an active labourer in the cause of the Reformation. But at the death of that King, the commencement of the Marian persecution immediately deprived him of all opportunity of exertion, and led him, by successive steps of suffering, to the scene of martyrdom, with which his resignation to the will of his divine Master was at last most gloriously consummated.

After the Queen was come to the Tower, he preached a sermon at Paul's Cross, in which he boldly asserted the doctrines which he had

* Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. iii. p. 98.

taught during the reign of Edward, and exhorted the people "constantly to remain in the same, and to beware of Popery, idolatry, and superstition." The Council, in which the Papists then predominated, called him to account for this sermon. At first, however, he successfully defended himself, and was dismissed without injury. But upon the proclamation being issued, which prohibited the preaching of the reformed doctrine, he was again summoned before the Council, and being examined, was commanded to keep his own house as a prisoner. He obeyed this sentence, though he could without difficulty have escaped by going abroad from the hands of his persecutors, and though he had the strongest worldly inducements to flight, as he was sure of obtaining a provision in Germany, and he had a family of ten children depending on him for support.

So gentle an imprisonment was not sufficient to satisfy the malignity of such a man as Bonner. After some time, accordingly, he was removed to Newgate, and there confined amongst thieves and murderers.

The first examination which he underwent, subsequently to this removal, was on the 22d of January, 1555. On this occasion, he was asked by Bishop Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor, according to the usual mode of proceeding in such cases, whether, after the example which had been set by the Parliament in returning to its allegiance to Rome, he would be "content to unite and knit himself with the faith of the Catholic Church with them, in the state in which it was then in England?" He replied, "The Catholic Church I never did, nor will dissent from." Gardiner explained, that he meant by the Catholic Church, that state of things in which the Pope was acknowledged to be Supreme Head. Rogers said, "he knew none other Head but Christ of his Catholic Church, neither would acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to have any more authority than any other Bishop had by the Word of God, and by the doctrine of the old and pure Catholic Church four hundred years after Christ." "Why didst thou, then," resumed Gardiner, "acknowledge King Henry VIII. to be the Supreme Head of the Church, if Christ be the only Head?" Rogers denied that he had ever granted him a supremacy in spiritual things, such as the forgiveness of sins—the giving of the Holy Ghost—authority to be a judge above the Word of God. Gardiner, with the Bishops of Durham and Worcester, ridiculed this assertion, and hinted, that had he made such a declaration in the days of Henry, he would not have been alive at that time—whereupon, he would have explained further what was understood by the King's supremacy, but his examiners looked and laughed one upon another, and made so great an uproar, that he was compelled to let the subject pass. He was about to shew, that there could not be two Heads of a Church, in refutation of what Gardiner had observed to the Lord William Howard, who was present at the examination, that "Christ might be Supreme Head and the Bishop of Rome also;" when Gardiner interrupted him with the repetition of his first question: "What sayst thou, make us a direct answer, whether thou wilt be one of this Catholic Church or not, with us in the state in which we are now?" Rogers objected to them their own inconsistency in acknowledging at that time the supre-

macy of the Pope, which they and all the Bishops of the realm had preached against for twenty years previous—many of them, too, having condemned it by their writings, and the Parliament having declared against it. Gardiner, evading the charge of personal inconsistency, urged as a plea for the Parliament, that it had been “with most great cruelty constrained to abolish and put away the primacy from the Bishop of Rome.” This afforded Rogers ground for a just animadversion on the present proceedings of the Papal faction against their Protestant brethren:—“With cruelty,” he observed,—“why then I perceive that you take a wrong way with cruelty to persuade men’s consciences. For it should appear by your doings now, that the cruelty then used hath not persuaded your consciences. How would you then have our consciences persuaded with cruelty?” “I talk to thee of no cruelty,” subjoined Gardiner, “but that they were so often and so cruelly called upon, in that Parliament, to let the Act go forward, yea, and even with force driven thereunto, whereas in this Parliament it was so uniformly received as is aforesaid;” alluding to the readiness which had been shewn by the Parliament in restoring the authority of the Pope. Rogers argued, that truth was not to be decided by numbers, but by the “wiser, truer, and godlier part,” and was proceeding to make further observations, when he was again interrupted with a repetition of the first question: to which he answered, that he must first see the fact pressed upon him proved by the Scriptures, and asked permission to discuss the question on paper. This request was not conceded. He was told, that he would never have so much proffered him again, as was now:—that there were two things—mercy and justice—if he refused the Queen’s mercy now, he should have justice ministered unto him. He replied, that “he had never offended, nor had been disobedient to her Grace, nor yet would he refuse her mercy.” “But if it shall be denied me,” he continued, “to confer by writing, and to try out the truth, then it is not well, but too far out of the way. Ye yourselves (all the Bishops of the realm) brought me to the knowledge of the pretended primacy of the Bishop of Rome, when I was a young man, twenty years past; and will ye now, without collation, have me to say and do the contrary? I cannot be so persuaded.” “If thou wilt not receive the Bishop of Rome to be the Supreme Head of the Catholic Church,” said Gardiner, “then thou shalt never have her mercy, thou mayst be sure. And as touching conferring and trial, I am forbidden by the Scriptures to use any conferring and trial with thee. For St. Paul teacheth me, that I should shun and eschew an heretic after one or two monitions, knowing that such an one is overthrown, and is faulty, insomuch as he is condemned by his own judgment.” His answer was, “My Lord, I deny that I am an heretic; prove ye that first, and then allege the foresaid text.” Gardiner, as he had done before, when pressed in a way that he could not answer, returned to the old topic of Papal supremacy, demanding the prisoner’s submission to it. When he repeated, that it must be proved to him by Scripture, the Bishop of Worcester observed, “Why, do ye not know what is in your creed: *Credo Ecclesiam sanctam Catholicam*. I believe the Holy Catholic Church.” To this he re-

plied, "I find not the Bishop of Rome there. For Catholic signifieth not the Romish Church: it signifieth the consent of all true teaching Churches of all times, and all ages. But how should the Bishop of Rome's Church be one of them, which teacheth so many doctrines that are plainly and directly against the Word of God? Can that Bishop be the true Head of the Catholic Church that doth so? that is not possible." Being called upon to produce one of such doctrines taught by the Church of Rome, he said, "The Bishop of Rome and his Church, say, read, and sing, all that they do in their congregations, in Latin, which is directly and plainly against the 1st to the Corinthians, the 14th chapter." Gardiner denied that the practice was against the Word of God, and called for the proofs. Rogers then proceeded to quote the texts of St. Paul from the chapter which he had mentioned, and to argue upon them, but his adversaries were again so clamorous in their opposition, that he was not allowed freely to explain himself. He endeavoured to shew that the words of St. Paul, where he mentions speaking "not unto men, but unto God," in the 2nd verse were not inconsistent with what he says in the 9th verse, as to the speaking in an unknown tongue, being as if one spoke "into the air"—but the question was carried against him by the dogmatic zeal of his Papal inquisitors: Gardiner abruptly concluding the discussion with saying—"No, no, thou canst prove nothing by the Scriptures. The Scripture is dead: it must have a lively expositor." When he contradicted this derogatory account of the Scriptures, and begged that he might go on with his purpose, he was answered by the Bishop of Worcester, that "all heretics alleged the Scriptures, and that therefore a living expositor was needed." Rogers urged, that still the Scriptures were the only means by which heretics were overcome, though they might not allow that they were so refuted; and was returning to his former argument, when the confusion among his examiners obliged him to desist. At last, Gardiner ordered him to be conducted back to prison, upon which he rose, having kneeled through the course of the previous examination.* Sir Richard Southwell, who stood by, observed to him, "Thou wilt not burn in this gear, when it cometh to the purpose, I know well that." "Sir," replied Rogers, "I cannot tell, but I trust in my Lord God," at the same time lifting up his eyes to heaven.

The remainder of this examination turned chiefly on the fact of his marriage, as a Priest, which he defended as lawful, not only in the place where it was celebrated, as he had been married abroad, but also in England at the time when he returned: and that after much vexation he was at last dismissed in the custody of the Serjeant.

He was again brought before the Bishops, and examined on the 28th and 29th of January. He was asked, on the first of these days, as on the former occasion, whether he would return to the Church of Rome, and on his disclaiming its authority as antichristian, some altercation arose between the Bishops and himself. They entered then on the subject of the Sacrament, and proposed to him the question, "Whether he believed in the Sacrament to be the very body and blood of our Saviour Christ, that was born of the Virgin Mary, and hanged on

the cross, really and substantially?" He answered to this question, "That he had often told Gardiner that it was a matter in which he was no meddler, and therefore had been suspected of his brethren to be of a contrary opinion: that notwithstanding, even as the most part of their doctrine in other points was false, and the defence thereof only by force and cruelty, so in this matter he thought it to be as false as the rest. For he could not understand really and substantially to signify otherwise than corporally; but, corporally, Christ was only in heaven, and so could not be corporally also in their Sacrament." He then complained to them of the hard treatment which he had experienced at their hands, in having been imprisoned now a full year in Newgate, at great costs and charges, besides six months previous in his own house, without receiving any portion of the income of his livings. They justified, in their answer, the severity which had been exercised towards him, on the ground of his having preached against the Queen, (which he explicitly denied,) and the deprivation of his livings, on the pretext that they were unjustly possessed, Ridley, who had given them to him, being regarded as an usurper of the bishopric of London.

On the evening of that day, he was sent to the Compter in Southwark, in company with Bishop Hooper and others, who had also been examined on the same day. As the prisoners passed through the streets, the people thronged around them in such numbers, that it was with difficulty that they could make their way through the crowds.

The day after they were again brought to the church of St. Mary Overies, where the previous examination had taken place, and submitted to a similar process of examination. Rogers stedfastly maintained his right of appeal to the Scripture against the erroneous voice of an obsequious Parliament, to whose decision he had before been requested to submit his judgment; but was not permitted to proceed to any length in justification of his opinions, being silenced by the interference of Gardiner, who, in a taunting manner, bade him sit down, saying, "that he was sent for to be instructed of them, and would take upon him to be their instructor." He endeavoured again to obtain a hearing, pointing out that the Church of Rome, in reference to its false doctrines and tyrannical laws maintained by cruel persecutions, was the Church of Antichrist, and explaining in what sense he condemned the Sacrament; but Gardiner at length closed the proceedings, by reading the sentences of excommunication and condemnation. Two articles were particularly alleged against him in the form of condemnation:—That he affirmed the Romish Catholic Church to be the Church of Antichrist,—and that he denied the reality of their Sacrament. When Gardiner had read the condemnation, he further declared that the prisoner "was in the great curse, and that it was dangerous to eat and drink with those so accursed, or to give them any thing; for all that did so should be partakers of the same great curse."

The sentence being pronounced, "Well, my lord," said Rogers, "I stand before God and you, and all this honourable audience, and take him to witness, that I never wittingly or willingly taught any false doctrine, and therefore have I a good conscience before God and all good men. I am sure that you and I shall come before a Judge

that is righteous, before whom I shall be as good a man as you : and I nothing doubt but that I shall be found there a true member of the true Catholic Church of Christ, and everlastingly saved. And, as to your false church, ye need not to excommunicate me forth of it. I have not been in it these twenty years, the Lord be thanked therefore. But now ye have done what ye can, my Lord, I pray you yet grant me one thing." Gardiner inquiring what this request was ; " That my poor wife, being a stranger, may come and speak with me so long as I live. For she hath ten children that are her's and mine, and somewhat I would counsel her, what were best for her to do."—" No," replied the obdurate Papist, " she is not thy wife ;" and Rogers again asserting her right to the title, he expressly refused her all liberty of access to him.

The Sheriffs having again received him into their custody, conveyed him in company with Hooper, to a prison called the Clink, where it was ordered that both should remain until night, lest they should experience interruption from the people, who deeply sympathized in their fate, in passing through the streets. The same evening accordingly they were conducted back to Newgate ; Hooper going before with one of the Sheriffs, and Rogers following with the other.

Rogers employed himself in prison in writing down the particulars of his several examinations, and in composing a defence of the principles and proceedings of the Reformers ; enjoying a perfect composure of mind, and even merry under the certain prospect of the cruel death to which he was shortly to be led out. He carefully concealed the book in which he had written these last records of his faithful zeal for the Gospel, evidently with a view to their surviving as memorials of the true profession which he had maintained, in contradiction to any injurious representations which the Papists might give of his case. This book, fortunately, escaped the most active scrutiny of his enemies, who searched for his letters and papers throughout his imprisonment ; and was only accidentally discovered by one of his sons after his death, who came with his widow to the place where he had been confined, and after having in vain searched the apartment, was going away, when he espied a black object, which proved to be the book, lying in a dark corner under a staircase.

On the morning of Monday, the 4th of February, 1555, he received a sudden intimation from the keeper's wife at Newgate, that his execution was to take place on that day. He was waked from his sleep to receive the dreadful summons, and though he must, since his condemnation, have been daily expecting the event, yet so securely did he repose, with such tranquillity of heart did this servant of God commit himself to the disposal of Divine Providence, that he required much shaking to rouse him from the deep sleep in which he was unconsciously lulled. At length being fully awakened and raised up, and desired to make haste, he merely observed, in his usual style of cheerful resignation, " If it be so, I need not tie my points ;" and then accompanied his conductors to the house of Bonner, where he submitted to the ceremony of degradation. That ceremony being over, he craved of Bonner one petition. Bonner asking him what that might be ; " Nothing," he replied, " but that he might talk a few words with his wife before

his burning." Bonner, however, would not consent that the sufferings of this victim of persecution should experience even this tender alleviation. All that Rogers said in return for so savage a refusal was, "Then you declare your charity, what it is."

The Sheriffs of London then conveyed him to Smithfield, there to undergo the torture of the fire. As he proceeded on the way he repeated the Psalm *Miserere*, the people at the same time expressing their great admiration at his constancy, and praising God, who supported him under such trials. There were present on the occasion, Rochester, Comptroller of the Queen's household, and Sir Richard Southwell, besides both the Sheriffs, and a great multitude of persons, whom the spectacle itself had attracted to the spot. He was met on the way by his wife, and children, then eleven in number, and the youngest an infant in the arms of its mother. This sorrowful sight, so pathetically appealing to the most sensitive feelings of human nature, while it must have pierced his inmost soul with a pang, yet could not unnerve the noble spirit of the man, or make him recoil from his firm purpose of yielding up himself a martyr to the Gospel. He still cheerfully advanced to the stake with undiminished resignation. When he had reached it, he addressed the spectators briefly—for he was not allowed to use many words—exhorting them "to remain in that faith and true doctrine which he before had taught, and they had learned, and, for the confirmation whereof, he was not only content patiently to suffer and bear all such bitterness and cruelty as had been showed him, but also most gladly to resign up his life, and give his flesh to the consuming fire, for the testimony of the same." He then encountered the fire with a surprizing fortitude, washing his hands in the flame as he was burning, until his whole body was consumed to ashes. A little before the pile of faggots was kindled, his pardon was brought, and offered to him on the condition of his recanting; but he resolutely disclaimed the acceptance of it on such terms. He appears, indeed, to have divested himself entirely of those fears of death, which disquiet ordinary minds; for, on the Sunday previous to his execution, he drank to Hooper, who was confined in a chamber underneath him, and bade the attendants commend him unto him, and tell him "there was never little fellow better would stick to a man, than he would stick to him." This he said, supposing that they would be burned together; which was not however the case, as Hooper was burnt at Gloucester some days after the execution of Rogers*. So also when the Sheriffs came to take him from Newgate, on the morning of his execution, one of them having asked him "if he would revoke his abominable doctrine, and his evil opinion of the sacrament of the altar"—he answered, "That which I have preached I will seal with my blood."—"Then," said the Sheriff, "thou art an heretic."—"That shall be known," said Rogers, "at the day of judgment."—"Well," added the Sheriff, "I will never pray for thee."—"But I will pray for you," said the meek and charitable sufferer; and then proceeded on the way to his death.

The kindness of his heart was eminently shewn in his conduct to-

* See p. 81, &c.

wards his fellow-prisoners in Newgate. To relieve those who were destitute of means of providing for their daily subsistence, he introduced the regulation, that those on his side of the prison should have but one meal a day, though they paid the expense of the whole; the other meal being given to the poor prisoners on the other side. This measure of charity was however thwarted through the rigour of Alexander, the keeper, who would not suffer the arrangement to take place.

Fox has noticed Rogers's prophetic anticipation of the triumphs of the Reformation; as a light which should arise out of that thick darkness with which the religious horizon was then overcast. Among other proofs of this predictive sagacity, is mentioned a conversation which Rogers had with the Printer of Fox's work, then his fellow-prisoner in Newgate. "Thou," said he, "shalt live to see the alteration of this religion, and the Gospel to be freely preached again: and therefore have me commended to my brethren, as well in exile as others, and bid them be circumspect in displacing the Papists, and putting good Ministers into Churches, or else their end will be worse than ours." He farther suggested to the same person his plan for ordering the affairs of the Church, by appointing a superintendant for every ten parishes, who should have readers under them, subject to the annual inspection of the bishops, who should remove as well the superintendants as the ministers, in case of the failure of any individual, either in improving his own knowledge, or attending to his parishioners.

In his prosperous days, in the reign of Edward, he shewed his zeal for the Reformation in a matter apparently trifling, but in those times of more importance than we may at present conceive, when the object was to exclude from offices in the Church men secretly inclined to popery, under the pretext of outward conformity. The dispute which originated at Hooper's appointment to a bishopric respecting the use of the vestments, is well known. Rogers, who usually wore a round cap, when uniformity in the ministerial dress was prescribed, affirmed that he would not give his sanction to it, by adopting it, unless a difference were made between the Papists and the Reformed, by obliging the former to wear upon their sleeves the figure of a chalice and a host; and accordingly himself never wore the priest's cap.

In these days of boasted refinement, we are too apt to deride the honest scruples of our forefathers, as antiquated prejudices, and the remnants of an exploded bigotry. They may, indeed, in some instances, have carried those scruples too far. But the tendency of these times is to the opposite extreme, to explain away and abolish differences, and so to produce a specious conformity under essential discrepancy of tenets. But even little matters are important when they serve to distinguish the true professors of Christianity from the hypocritical, the superstitious, and the arrogant corrupters of its doctrines. While, then, we reverence the piety and magnanimity of such men as Rogers, and his fellow martyrs, in the greatest actions of their lives, we may derive a seasonable lesson from that example of an uncompromising love for the truth, which they have exhibited to us in their conduct with re-

gard to even inferior matters belonging to religion. Nothing, in their eye was little, of which the enemy could avail himself to the undermining of the faith. Let us cultivate, like them, a conciliatory spirit—a spirit of gentleness and moderation—but let us not, at the same time, retire from one inch of the ground, which they maintained by their wisdom and their blood.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Letter to the Right Reverend C. J. Blomfield, D.D. Bishop of Chester, from Charles Butler, Esq. in Vindication of a Passage in his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," censured in a Letter addressed to him by his Lordship. 8vo. pp. 31. Murray. 1825.

It is, as we suspected it would be. Mr. Butler has proved unable to reply to the questions put to him by the Bishop of Chester, respecting his scandalous imputation on the veracity of the Clergy of the Church of England, without exposing himself to the recoil of his own weapons, with still more fatal force on himself. He was required to produce his proofs of the "smiles and sighs," which, he says, accompany the subscriptions to the Articles of the Church of England, by the great body of the Clergy. We venture to say, he has produced no proof, nothing approaching to a proof, of the statement advanced in his work; and no exculpation, consequently, of his attack on the religion and morality of his Protestant brethren.

To have substantiated his charge, he was called upon to adduce positive *facts*. He had stated a general fact—a regard to logic, as well as to veracity, required that he should bring forward a *sufficient* number of instances, in order to verify his general conclusion. His induction of particulars must have been very extensive, to satisfy the latitude of his inference, and completely to justify his allegation—it must have reached to *many* particulars, at any rate, to have rendered his assertion in the slightest degree probable. Many a sigh must have breathed its solemn evidence on his ear, and many a smile have told its traitorous tale to his conscious eye, to have enabled him to present them in such audible and visible forms of frightful reality, as those in which they appear in the pages of his book.

Instead, however, of a single instance of any actual sigh or smile on the part of a subscriber, he has produced only *suppo-*

sitions of such instances; and these suppositions grounded on the various constructions which different authors have adopted of the subscription required to the Articles. The *fact* itself he has evaded, and only supported the general imputation, by more specific imputations, which require also some other point not proved to be conceded to him.

The futility indeed of his defence has been amply exposed by the Bishop of Chester, in a Postscript to the third edition of his Letter to Mr. Butler; and so far as an *answer* is concerned, nothing more needs to be said on the subject;—but as Mr. B. has referred largely to our Divines in support of his opinion, it may not be irrelevant to follow him more closely into his favourite authorities, and examine how far they bear him out in his assertions.

In proceeding to explain ourselves, we shall invert the order of his inquiry. He brings forward a petition against subscription to the Articles presented to the House of Commons in 1772, which was signed by “two hundred and fifty clergymen, and several gentlemen belonging to the profession of the civil law,” (and medicine, 3rd edition) in respect to which he asks, whether “a *sigh* for the *necessity* of subscription” is not most distinctly heard in every line of it?—He then asks, whether Dr. Samuel Clarke and Dr. Clayton did not sigh when they subscribed? Appealing next to a passage of Burnet, in which the greater part of the Clergy are spoken of, as “subscribing to the Articles *without ever examining them*,” and others as doing it “because they *must* do it, though they can *hardly satisfy their consciences* about some things in them,” he again asks whether there must not be *some smiles* among the subscribers thus mentioned? Also, whether Dr. Conyers Middleton did not *smile* at the moment of subscribing—whether certain persons, whom, in his own style of graceful insinuation, he represents by a number of emphatic dots, did not? He then pronounces, with satisfaction, at the result which he thinks he has reached, “Thus have I answered both the questions put to me by your lordship.”

Now, where is there any answer in all this to the Bishop of Chester's call for proofs—proofs from Mr. Butler's own experience—of the assertion advanced respecting the subscription to the Articles, we are quite unable to perceive. Certain of the Clergy concurred with some of the laity in a petition against the *necessity* of subscription—ergo, the great body of the Clergy *subscribe* the articles with a sigh. Where is the connexion between the fact of petition and the fact of the subscription? Because some members of the Church of England, who had already put their hands to the truth of the Articles, wished the terms of comprehension extended, and that others might not

necessarily be subjected to the same test—is that any ground for impugning the conscientiousness of the petitioners in respect to their own subscriptions? Because certain Roman Catholics petition the legislature for the removal of civil disabilities, is that any reason for our doubting their loyalty under their present restrictions. The two cases are similar in their relation to the constraint to which both parties are submitted—the one being a case of limitation, the other of exclusion. If some of the Clergy petitioned against the limitation, why should they be thought less honest in their submission to it, than the petitioning Roman Catholics in their submission to the restraint under which they live? But it is needless to spend words on the matter. Every one who considers the fact which Mr. Butler has brought forward, will see that it makes nothing for his defence. At most, his opinion respecting the petitioners amounts only to a suspicion entertained by himself respecting them. The sighs which he hears, are only the hearings of his own imagination.

So also as to Dr. Samuel Clarke and Bishop Clayton; all he alleges is in the form of a question. Did they not sigh when they subscribed? Where, we ask again, is his proof that they did, as he *supposes* them to have done? Is it not very possible for a man to entertain an opinion very conscientiously at one time, which he may see reason conscientiously to alter at another time? His defence, then, from these instances, again amounts to nothing more than an unwarranted imputation against these individuals.

Then, as to the *smile*—he is still very far from giving any real indisputable instance. His strongest evidence rests upon the expressions of Burnet. But does the passage in question apply to the Clergy of the present day? Is there any thing in it equivalent to a general smile on the part of subscribers at the present day? Let him read the whole passage, as it occurs in the context of Burnet, and he must agree with us that it gives no countenance to a loose mode of subscription. It is as follows—

“The requiring subscriptions to the Thirty-nine Articles is a great imposition: I believe them all myself: but as those about original sin and predestination might be expressed more unexceptionably, so I think it is a better way to let such matters continue to be still the standard of doctrine, with some few corrections, and to censure those who teach any contrary tenets; than to oblige all that serve in the Church, to subscribe them: the greater part subscribe without ever examining them; and others do it, because they must do it, though they can hardly satisfy their consciences about some things in them. Churches and societies are much better secured by laws than by sub-

scriptions: it is a more reasonable as well as a more easy method of government."—*Burnet's History of his own Time*, vol. ii. folio, p. 634.

Burnet evidently is only expressing his regret that subscription should be adopted on the part of the Church *as the mode of securing conformity*. And, as an argument against it, he adduces its liability to abuse; and it is upon the supposed general existence of such abuse *in his own times*, that he would have the necessity of subscription removed, and not from any laxity of principle which is *permitted* by means of it. He objects to the *obligation* of subscription, while he is himself convinced that the Articles are true.

These supposed sighs and smiles, however, rest on a supposed latitude of construction in interpreting the articles, which, he insists, must lead to one or other of these expressions of sentiment. But, first, we must protest against his own latitude of construction in interpreting these obnoxious terms, which he has taken from the mouth of an infidel. The sigh of a subscriber, surely, means something more than a *regret that a subscription should be required*—and a smile something more than the *heedlessness* of a *young and inconsiderate* subscriber. To allow such interpretation as that he has given, a much greater latitude of construction must be indulged him, than we fancy even the latitudinarian Hoadly would have conceded to the act of subscription. The former must be understood as a *protest against the doctrines* contained in the Articles—the latter as a *derision* of them. But Mr. Butler will say, that though the words are Gibbon's, in adopting them he is entitled to limit them, or explain them away, as it may serve his purpose. We shall not therefore dwell on this point; we shall only say, that he has not understood the smile according to his own account of it, when he imputes it to Conyers Middleton. Mr. Butler surely does not mean to say, that Conyers Middleton signed with the heedlessness of an undergraduate. Having just noticed this, we pass on to the grounds of his assertion—the latitude of construction which he pleads is allowed by some of our divines, whose opinions are influential with the body of the Clergy.

We maintain, then, that no such latitude of construction is allowed as would warrant the laxity of principle implied by the terms which he has employed. Persons may conscientiously differ as to the nature and the necessity of a subscription to any particular formulary of doctrine, without differing as to the truth of the doctrine which it contains. The propriety of subscription is a question quite independent of the truth of the doctrines to which it is required to be made. Two persons may agree exactly in every proposition contained in the Articles,

but one may think that they are sufficiently enunciated in the Scriptures themselves, and that to resort to any other authorized statement of them is to detract from the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures; whilst the other may see, in the use of such an auxiliary form of doctrine, no infringement of the supremacy of Scripture authority, but rather a requisite help to the infirmities and vacillations of human judgment. Of two persons, again, also exactly agreeing in the truth of the doctrines contained, as well as in the propriety of a certain prescribed form, one may regard that form simply as a bond of union, or articles of peace—while the other, with stricter views of the subject, may insist on the necessity of its being a test of consent in opinion, or of religious belief. Thus it appears that the question, as it regards the nature of a subscription, is actually independent of the truth or falsehood of the doctrines. The doctrines being supposed to be true, it may yet be debated whether the Church, or the Legislature rather, ought to impose subscription of them *in that form*. Mr. Butler's quotation, then, from Chillingworth, Burnet, and Bramhall, (we are glad to find he has corrected the error of the first edition, in which the name of Usher was put for Bramhall,) and his introduction of the names of Laud, Sheldon, Fowler, Watson, Balguy, Sturges, Paley, will not serve his purpose of shewing that the Articles may be subscribed, by those who follow the authorities of these great names, with either a sigh or a smile. All that he could infer from the opinions of these eminent writers is, that the articles may be subscribed by persons holding different opinions as to the *nature* and the *necessity*, or the *propriety* of subscription: the *doctrines themselves being supposed to be true*.

We will consider, however, more closely the instances which he produces of a latitudinarian construction.

First, he brings forward a celebrated passage of the "immortal Chillingworth," in which he declares that that celebrated writer discards the "Thirty-nine Articles, among other creeds, and propounds that "the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." And upon this passage he proceeds to remark, that it is unnecessary to observe to his Lordship, the Bishop of Chester, that this proposition was received without any qualification by Bishop Hoadly, and transmitted by him to his followers, or that Bishop Hoadly is, in respect to theological belief and opinion, the "patriarch of nearly the whole of the present ministry of the Established Church of England."

Now, in regard to this passage of Chillingworth, there is not a Clergyman of the Established Church, we conceive, who would not acknowledge its truth without feeling that he compromised by such acknowledgment his respect for the Thirty-

nine Articles, and the sincerity of his subscription to them. It asserts the comparative superiority of the Scriptures as an authority in sacred truth above every other authority. This is the high ground on which our Church justifies her secession from the Roman Communion, wherein the authority of the Priesthood ranks above that of the Sacred Volume. We can cordially, therefore, say, that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the *religion* of Protestants. We do not consider, then, the Articles as our *religion*, nor exalt them, as he supposes, into another *code of law*. We regard them only as *expressions* of that which subsists in the living oracles themselves. We could much rather retort on Mr. Butler, that he cannot consistently profess the Scriptures and tradition to be his codes of law, whilst he attributes so high an authority to the word of his Priesthood—but this is nothing to the purpose. We would impress on his notice that, while we respect the formulary of our Articles, we do not derogate in the least by such respect from the *exclusiveness* of the Scriptures as our rule of faith. We subscribe the Articles because we believe them to be conformable to the word of express revelation, not from any idea of their intrinsic and independent validity. Supposing Mr. Butler to deliver his opinion in writing on the value of Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England, would it follow that he thereby established another code of laws besides the laws themselves? Would he not readily answer to any person who accused him of such an act, that he only esteemed Blackstone, because he conceived him to be a just and true commentator on those laws which he venerated for themselves? The words of Chillingworth, indeed, leave no divine *authority* to the Thirty-nine Articles, but still they leave a binding authority to them, as far as the subscription of them is concerned, among the members of the Church. If the Church required her members to *believe* in the Articles *as articles*, instead of requiring an assent to them as statements of Scripture truth, then would she fall under the terms of Chillingworth's censure, where he says, "I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of man than this, to believe the Scriptures to be God's word, to endeavour to find the true sense." She does not require a belief of any thing further than this, that the Scriptures are God's word, and upon the strength of that belief proposes her Articles for subscription. The fact is, none could sign her Articles conscientiously, who did not believe that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.

As for the manner in which Bishop Hoadly understood this passage of Chillingworth, it is quite immaterial to the point. No orthodox member of the Church recognizes Hoadly as her

genuine son. He was a Dissenter in the Church. Notwithstanding Mr. Butler's calumny, which asserts that Hoadly is the patriarch of nearly the whole of the present ministry of the Established Church, we must profess our firm conviction that neither Hoadly's name or opinions are held in any respect by the great body of the Clergy. Mr. Butler is not, we presume, versed in modern English Divinity, or in the habit of hearing sermons preached by our parochial Clergy, or he could not for a moment maintain that they were the disciples of Hoadly. Still more strange is it, that he should appeal to the Bishop of Chester's supposed knowledge of a fact, the existence of which the Bishop has already virtually denied, in his reply to the former attack. Nor would he, we conceive, have spoken of "the Creed of Chillingworth and Hoadly," as if these two men agreed in their principles, had he been himself conversant with the writings of each.

Chillingworth, he adds, objected to the subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles, expressing his objection with passionate vehemence, yet "within a few months after" subscribed them: a few years he should have said, for three years intervened between his refusal to subscribe in 1635, and his admission to the Chancellorship of Sarum, in 1638, when he did subscribe. The only just inference is, that he had scruples at one time which he found afterwards to be groundless. Indeed, we know his scruples were against the damnable clauses of the Athanasian Creed, and to the fourth Commandment, which he considered to be abrogated by Christianity, in the substitution of Sunday as the holy day. There is no ground for supposing that he signed the Articles with these scruples still existing in his mind. And if not, there is no ground for suspecting his sincerity, or the sincerity of any with whom his example and opinion may have weight. Whether he regarded the Articles as articles of peace or of faith, signifies nothing as to the conscientiousness of his assent thereby expressed.

To argue to a person that his subscription to the Articles is not to be understood so as to invalidate the exclusive authority of the Scripture, may overcome an objection to his signature without involving a compromise of his principles of belief; and they may be signed without a sigh or a smile, by one who even thinks *at the moment of subscribing*, that it would be more expedient to dispense with the *obligation* of subscription.

The nature, indeed, of Chillingworth's subscription has been controverted—Dr. Bennet, in his Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles, maintaining that Chillingworth subscribed to the *truth* of the Articles, and his biographer arguing that he only subscribed them as articles of peace. That he believed the doctrines contained in them, is plain from his own words, in his reply

to the Jesuit Knott, where he says—"for the Church of England, I am so persuaded that the constant doctrine of it is so pure and orthodox, that whosoever believes it and lives according to it, undoubtedly he shall be saved." And further, that Mr. Butler may not suppose that he was a Socinian, notwithstanding all this, in a letter to Mr. Lewgar, he says, "the imputing Socinianism to me, whoever was the author of it, was a wicked and groundless scandal."

We shall presently consider more particularly the quotation itself, which he has introduced "at length," in a note, and go on now to his other authorities.

Archbishops Laud and Sheldon are adduced, upon the authority of the "*Biographia Britannica*," as having held the same doctrine of subscription as that ascribed to Chillingworth—Sheldon, indeed, as "the person that brought him into it." Now it is not clear that such was the opinion of Laud. The biographer of Chillingworth evidently argues on a passage of Laud's relation of his conference with the Jesuit Fisher, in which the Archbishop is defending the use of the Thirty-nine Articles, in opposition to the method, adopted in the Church of Rome, of determining points, and making them matters of necessary belief, which had before been accounted only for "things of *pious opinions*." Laud's only object, it appears, is to shew that the Church of England has never declared that "*every one* of her Articles are fundamental in the faith, and that she prescribes only to *her own children*, and by those Articles provides for her own *peaceable* consent in those doctrines of truth." There is no authority in his words for a fallacious subscription by the sons of the Church—he is only justifying the imposition of them. There is no sanction for dissent under a specious unity of agreement.

Nor is there any letter extant of Sheldon, in which he labours to overcome the scruples of Chillingworth, by suggesting a latitude of construction on the points of doctrine set forth by the Articles. He only speaks of them as "general forms of peace," which may as reasonably at least be applied to the vindication of them, as contradistinguished from the authority claimed by the Church of Rome, as to any limitation of assent to the doctrines contained in them.

Archbishop Bramhall is Mr. Butler's next authority. Neither again is there here any authority for a latitude of belief in the doctrines of the Articles. Bishop Stillingfleet, citing the same passage of Bramhall, explains the difference between the Church of Rome and our Church, in requiring assent to her Articles—shewing that the Church of England "makes no articles of faith but such as have the testimony and approbation of the whole Christian world of all ages, and are acknowledged

to be such by Rome itself; and in other things she requires subscription to them, not as *articles of faith*, but as *inferior truths*, which she expects a submission to, in order to her peace and tranquillity." He then introduces the passage of Bramhall, quoted by Mr. Butler. Now, any person who will examine that passage impartially, will find it to amount to nothing more than a declaration of the *moderation* of the Church of England—that she obtrudes her Articles upon no one, but that at the same time she will not suffer her members to reject or contradict them at their pleasure. A just toleration requires the former—the maintenance of Church discipline requires the latter. For our part we see no countenance for subscribing "with a sigh or a smile." We will, however, dwell more particularly on those passages in question.

In the first of these passages from Bramhall, the context is required for rightly understanding the author's words. He is not speaking at all of the formularies of the Thirty-nine Articles, or of the subscription to them. He is speaking of articles of opinion, as distinguished from articles of faith which are necessary to be believed in order to salvation, that is, as he expresses it, *neccessitate medii*, as means indispensably required in order to salvation; those, for instance, comprehended in the Apostles' Creed. Whereas, he urges, referring to such points as the negative of the doctrine of purgatory, "the Church does not define *these* (not *the*, as Mr. B. quotes him,) questions as *necessary* to be believed," either as means of salvation, or direct commands from God, "but only *bindeth* her sons for peace-sake, not to oppose them;" that is, she lays an obligation on them on other accounts to assent to them, namely, as essential to church communion.—The third edition, however, of Mr. Butler's pamphlet, which is not only "revised and *enlarged*," as the author informs us, but also *curtailed* where it was convenient, omits this quotation so prominently put forth in the first.

We pass on then to the second quotation from Bramhall. Here again evidently that Prelate is adverting to the distinction between necessary articles of faith and pious opinions; and to the latter alone do his observations apply; which are in this passage, as in the former, opposed to the method of the Romish Church, and have no application whatever to the mode of subscription. Besides, he does not say, with Mr. Butler in his first edition, "*as a mean*," but with Mr. Butler in his third edition, "*in a mean*," and by that expression teaches, that our Church is neither lax nor severe in her imposition of her opinions.

The name alone of Dr. Balguy had been brought forward in the first edition of the Pamphlet; in the third we have an extract from his writings. This however might as well have

been spared ; for it is nothing to the purpose. It only tends to shew that the articles are not our *rule of faith*, and that subscription to them is not, what Mr. Butler would have it to be, subscription to another code of law besides the Scriptures.

But, after enumerating other divines as favouring a loose construction under the notion of "articles of peace," Mr. B. mentions particularly Paley under this head, as representing by his opinions those of a large proportion of the clerical body. Paley, however, sanctions no looseness of belief in the doctrines subscribed: he only argues philosophically, that it is impossible that a great number of individuals can believe exactly alike; and he requires every one subscribing to be convinced that he is satisfying the intention of the legislature which imposes the subscription. There is not a little inconsistency besides in his making Paley in this place the leader of the Clergy in their opinions, whereas he before had assigned that post to Hoadly. Does he mean to say that Hoadly and Paley coincide?

Archdeacon Powell and Dr. Hey are next brought forward by him as the joint patrons of "a still looser construction of the Thirty-nine Articles." "The formulary of the Thirty-nine Articles," according to these divines, he says, "hath experienced a *tacit reformation*, the language of them having, in consequence of various circumstances, *lost its original sense*, and acquired that which *the subscribers* of them *conceive* they should now bear." Upon this representation he remarks; that neither the original nor the new construction here advocated are defined, but are left "at large to the *imagination* of the subscribers." But, does either Dr. Hey or Archdeacon Powell really say, that "*the formulary of the Articles hath experienced a tacit reformation*?" Dr. Hey says that the notion of a *tacit reformation* is the principle on which his argument proceeds, and supposing this principle to be true, his argument will be allowed to be just. If the whole Church has agreed to adopt a qualified sense of general expressions, and unanimously dispenses with a rigid interpretation of some obsolete expressions, then would the subscription of her sons, in conformity with this received modification, certainly be a conscientious subscription. For the test of subscription cannot be supposed to extend beyond the intention of the authority which requires it. But it remains to be proved, that the Church of England has undergone this *tacit reformation*: and before a subscriber can avail himself of Dr. Hey's opinion, he must have satisfied himself that his views of the doctrines are at any rate those which are authoritatively adopted by the Church at large. There is nothing left to his *imagination*. Archdeacon Powell, in his sermon on subscription, to which Mr. B. refers, argues against the very position, in favour

of which he has adduced his authority. He contends that the charge is unjust "which is brought against the English Clergy, that having departed from the meaning of their Articles, they all continue to subscribe what none believe"—having previously asserted that "our articles of religion are not merely articles of peace—they are designed also as a test of our opinions." (P. 33, Discourses.) And again, "he therefore who assents to our Articles, must have examined them, and be convinced of their truth." (P. 34.) But Mr. B. it seems lays his chief stress upon what Dr. Powell says with regard to the *impossibility* of the crime imputed to the Clergy, where he grounds his argument on the variable nature of language, as opening a door to various interpretations of the same expressions. But let it be observed, that he is here only justifying a charge founded on a *supposed* general departure from the meaning of the Articles—with reference to which he contends that there can be no falsehood in taking them in that sense in which they are generally received, as a payment is honestly made which is reckoned according to the current value of money. There is a fallacy, it must be admitted, in his argument, from the case of a payment in current money to that of the acceptance of the Articles, if the inference be conceived to extend to the *correctness* of such current acceptance—it not being in the contemplation of the framers of the Articles that the sense should be varied by circumstances, in that way in which the value of money is understood to be subject to variation in all pecuniary transactions; money itself being only the measure of the variable relations of commodities. But surely no charge of insincerity or prevarication can be brought against a person, who, however the current sense of the Articles may have varied from the original, *believing* that current sense to be *correct* subscribes them according to it. After all, however, neither Dr. Hey nor Dr. Powell, though very able writers, and the former in particular the Author of a very valuable work, (the "Lectures in Divinity,") are any great authorities with us. We are not bound to defend their opinions, or those of any others of our divines, to vindicate ourselves from a charge of insincere subscription*.

Mr. Butler then presumes that the Bishop of Chester will *admit* his conclusion—

"I believe your Lordship will admit, that the Articles are seldom subscribed (in his third edition *seriously* is inserted after subscribed) except in one or other of the saving senses I have mentioned, or with—

* There is a note, we find, in the third edition, appended to the criticism on Dr. Hey and Dr. Powell, containing an extract from Lord Clarendon, but what it has to do with the Articles, or subscription, or Mr. Butler's argument, we really cannot discover.

out some mixture of them all—and that few therefore subscribe them in their primitive, plain, obvious, and natural sense; or, in other words, in that sense which the Fathers of your Church intended to stamp upon them, and that they should indelibly bear." P. 15.

Upon this *presumed admission* of his Lordship, he asks whether he "has not fully shewn that the Articles are signed by the general body of the subscribers in the latitude of construction which he suggested?" Never, perhaps, was a conclusion more fancifully deduced. Certain divines, he urges, advocate a loose construction of the Articles. He then asks his opponent to grant that this supposed loose construction is adopted by the majority of the Clergy. Therefore, he concludes, the Articles are signed with the looseness of construction suggested by himself, or to return to his first expression "with a sigh or a smile."

We have endeavoured to point out that Mr. Butler has assumed that latitude of construction, on which he grounds his extenuation of his calumny against the Clergy—that the various views which have been given by some of our divines respecting the nature and the necessity or propriety of subscription, do not affect a belief in the truth of the doctrines. We contend, therefore, that they are not fundamentally at variance with those other divines, whose authorities he has introduced at the opening of his pamphlet, as to the substance of the Articles or the truth of the doctrines contained in them. The authorities, indeed, which are placed in front, relate more to a belief in the doctrines, and justly set forth that no equivocation or evasion can be admitted in regard to a belief of them by the person subscribing. The other class of authorities relates more to the *form* of setting them forth.

Mr. B. pointedly alludes to "the searching questions" of the Bishop of Peterborough, as if they were designed to obviate the "sighs and smiles" which he imagines to be so prevalent among subscribers. We regard these questions rather, as inquiries into the qualifications of the candidate who presents himself for ordination, as means of ascertaining whether he has rightly acquainted himself with the doctrines of his Church, in the same way in which the Thirty-nine Articles themselves are intended to ascertain whether the candidate has acquainted himself with the doctrines of Scripture.

Mr. B. also quotes a passage from the Bishop of Winchester's "Elements of Christian Theology;" but had he quoted it fully and correctly, he would not have concluded that his Lordship meant to denounce all difference of sentiment in the subscribers, while he very justly insists on the awful consequences of insincerity in so serious a concern. We do not

know whether there is any variation of readings in different editions of the Bishop's work, but we should suppose so from the extract given, for we find Mr. B. has placed a sentence first in order, which in the copy before us follows all that he has quoted from the Bishop. Then he has omitted the following sentences, which are by no means immaterial to the point at issue. "It is not indeed necessary that he (the candidate for orders) should approve every word or expression, but he ought to believe all the fundamental doctrines of the Articles; all those tenets in which our Church differs from other Churches, or other sects of Christians. He ought to feel that he can, from his own conviction, maintain the purity of our established religion, and sincerely and zealously enforce those points of faith and practice which our Church declares to be the revealed will of God *." Thus, while no insincerity is permitted, no bigotry is countenanced.

Mr. Butler, however, was expressly required by the Bishop of Chester to produce stronger proofs of his assertion than those which Dr. Milner had alleged. Well then may his Lordship have been astonished, when he observed, that Mr. Butler has only followed in the track of Dr. Milner, and produced no evidence beyond that, which that divine had already so unsatisfactorily set forth in his work, entitled the "End of Religious Controversy." Mr. Butler alludes to Chillingworth, as asserting that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants, to shew our inconsistency in the matter of our Articles. So does Dr. Milner. But what is strange, Mr. Butler professes to transcribe *the whole* of the memorable passage, but still gives us only a mutilated specimen of it. After the sentence where Chillingworth says, "I, for my part, after a long (and I verily believe and hope) impartial search of *the true way to eternal happiness*, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this rock only;" Mr. Butler immediately annexes the sentence beginning with—"This therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe,"—which would lead the reader to suppose that Chillingworth was professing his belief of the Scriptures alone, in opposition to the Articles; whereas, had Mr. B. inserted what immediately follows, every one would have seen that Chillingworth was arguing against the authorities received in the Church of Rome. The words here left out are these: "I see plainly, and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against themselves, and consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age. Traditional interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there

* Elements of Christian Theology, 1820, vol. ii. p. 572.

are few or none to be found: no tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon." Then follows the forcible declaration of the writer's own sincere profession, annexed by Mr. Butler to the former passage. This, however, though the most important, is not his only omission in transcribing "*the whole* of this memorable passage." A little lower, just before the last sentence quoted by him, occurs the following testimony of the writer's charity, which surely ought not to have been displaced: "I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian; I will love no man the less for differing in opinion with me; and what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again."

Again, in quoting from his letter to Sheldon, by the manner in which the sentiments of Chillingworth are represented, we are led to suppose that he gave Sheldon to understand, that if ever he did *subscribe the articles*, his friends might think him a madman and an Atheist. Whereas, on referring to his letter, it will be found, that he means to say, if ever *he preferred the world before the kingdom of God*, then might his friends so account him.

We cannot indeed but strongly suspect, with the Bishop of Chester, that Mr. Butler has not read the books which he quotes as authorities on his side, but has relied exclusively on the knowledge and accuracy of his learned vicar apostolic, Dr. Milner, alias Merlin. Bishop Hoadly is the favourite authority of that gentleman, and so he is with Mr. Butler. Bishop Watson, Dr. Balguy, Dr. Sturges, Dr. Paley, are names conspicuous in Dr. Milner's pages, and so they are in Mr. Butler's. Dr. Hey and Archdeacon Powell are brought together as advocates of an insincere interpretation of the Articles by Dr. Milner, and so they are by Mr. Butler. A passage of Burnet, in proof of the fact, is quoted by Dr. Milner, from the celebrated "Confessional," and the same passage is given by Mr. Butler. Dr. Milner refers his readers to Overton's "True Churchman ascertained;" Mr. Butler also refers to the same work. The petition in 1772, against subscription, is brought forward by Dr. Milner, and so it is by Mr. Butler. The Clergy of the Church of England are accused of Hoadlyism, which, he says, is another name for Socinianism, (Evid. of Rel. Con. p. 126. 1824.) by Dr. Milner, and so they are by Mr. Butler. They are accused of not believing their Articles by Dr. Milner, and so they are by Mr. Butler.—How to reconcile, indeed, Mr. Butler's former question, as to the sincerity of the belief of the Clergy in our Articles, with his present denial of having said or believed "that the English Clergy are hypocrites, liars, or

Socinians," particularly when it is found that he believes that the Clergy are mostly Hoadlyans, which, according to his authority, Dr. Milner, means Socinians, is a perplexity which requires a hardy ingenuity of casuistry to solve. May we suggest to him, if he fulfils the promise of his Postscript, to look beyond Dr. Milner. His favourite plan of study has failed him in this case; it being amongst his rules, we understand, in directing his attention to a literary object, "to read the best book upon it, consulting others as little as possible; where the subject was contentious, to read the best book on each side*." His best book in this case has sadly led him astray.

He would shelter himself, however, from the charge of having imputed hypocrisy and falsehood to the Clergy, under a rule of controversy, which forbids the imputing the consequences of any doctrine to those who hold it, unless they expressly avow them. Where is the application of this rule to his case? Where is the analogy between the speculative consequences of a doctrine, and the real meaning of particular expressions? There is a just reason for not imputing speculative consequences of a doctrine, because of the practical uncertainty which belongs to all speculative inferences, and because they may not be equally apprehended by those who simply hold the doctrine itself. But if we say that a man signs what he does not believe, or what he believes only in a sense which allows him also to disbelieve it, there can be no doubt that we call that man a hypocrite and a liar.

"You say," (the Bishop of Chester unanswerably urges,) "in p. 6, of your letter, that you do not *believe* that the English Clergy are hypocrites, liars, or Socinians: but in answer to your assertion that you never *said* so, I beg leave to remind you, that whoever imputes to me a disbelief of those vital doctrines of the Gospel, the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement, calls me, not indeed *in terminis*, but by implication, a Socinian: and that whoever charges me with having given my solemn assent to articles of faith *which I utterly disbelieve*, calls me, not in so many words, but by inevitable consequence, a hypocrite and a liar. I must therefore continue to maintain, that you have stigmatized the Clergy with these opprobrious appellations, until you shall absolutely retract that offensive question, of which, at present, you have given no explanation whatever."—P. 26. *Bishop of Chester's Postscript to Third Edition of his Letter.*

We would suggest to Mr. Butler's consideration, whether he has not violated two of the rules of controversy: 1st. in charging the body of the Clergy with the supposed delinquencies of opinion of some individuals among them? 2dly. In forming his opinion of them from the sayings of an adversary?

We have nothing to say with respect to the declamation in favour of the Roman Catholics, which is tacked on as the

* Butler's Reminiscences, p. 3.

are few or none to be found: no tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon." Then follows the forcible declaration of the writer's own sincere profession, annexed by Mr. Butler to the former passage. This, however, though the most important, is not his only omission in transcribing "*the whole of this memorable passage.*" A little lower, just before the last sentence quoted by him, occurs the following testimony of the writer's charity, which surely ought not to have been displaced: "I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian; I will love no man the less for differing in opinion with me; and what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again."

Again, in quoting from his letter to Sheldon, by the manner in which the sentiments of Chillingworth are represented, we are led to suppose that he gave Sheldon to understand, that if ever he did *subscribe the articles*, his friends might think him a madman and an Atheist. Whereas, on referring to his letter, it will be found, that he means to say, if ever *he preferred the world before the kingdom of God*, then might his friends so account him.

We cannot indeed but strongly suspect, with the Bishop of Chester, that Mr. Butler has not read the books which he quotes as authorities on his side, but has relied exclusively on the knowledge and accuracy of his learned vicar apostolic, Dr. Milner, alias Merlin. Bishop Hoadly is the favourite authority of that gentleman, and so he is with Mr. Butler. Bishop Watson, Dr. Balguy, Dr. Sturges, Dr. Paley, are names conspicuous in Dr. Milner's pages, and so they are in Mr. Butler's. Dr. Hey and Archdeacon Powell are brought together as advocates of an insincere interpretation of the Articles by Dr. Milner, and so they are by Mr. Butler. A passage of Burnet, in proof of the fact, is quoted by Dr. Milner, from the celebrated "Confessional," and the same passage is given by Mr. Butler. Dr. Milner refers his readers to Overton's "True Churchman ascertained;" Mr. Butler also refers to the same work. The petition in 1772, against subscription, is brought forward by Dr. Milner, and so it is by Mr. Butler. The Clergy of the Church of England are accused of Hoadlyism, which, he says, is another name for Socinianism, (Evid. of Rel. Con. p. 126. 1824.) by Dr. Milner, and so they are by Mr. Butler. They are accused of not believing their Articles by Dr. Milner, and so they are by Mr. Butler.—How to reconcile, indeed, Mr. Butler's former question, as to the sincerity of the belief of the Clergy in our Articles, with his present denial of having said or believed "that the English Clergy are hypocrites, liars, or

Socinians," particularly when it is found that he believes that the Clergy are mostly Hoadlyans, which, according to his authority, Dr. Milner, means Socinians, is a perplexity which requires a hardy ingenuity of casuistry to solve. May we suggest to him, if he fulfils the promise of his Postscript, to look beyond Dr. Milner. His favourite plan of study has failed him in this case; it being amongst his rules, we understand, in directing his attention to a literary object, "to read the best book upon it, consulting others as little as possible; where the subject was contentious, to read the best book on each side*." His best book in this case has sadly led him astray.

He would shelter himself, however, from the charge of having imputed hypocrisy and falsehood to the Clergy, under a rule of controversy, which forbids the imputing the consequences of any doctrine to those who hold it, unless they expressly avow them. Where is the application of this rule to his case? Where is the analogy between the speculative consequences of a doctrine, and the real meaning of particular expressions? There is a just reason for not imputing speculative consequences of a doctrine, because of the practical uncertainty which belongs to all speculative inferences, and because they may not be equally apprehended by those who simply hold the doctrine itself. But if we say that a man signs what he does not believe, or what he believes only in a sense which allows him also to disbelieve it, there can be no doubt that we call that man a hypocrite and a liar.

"You say," (the Bishop of Chester unanswerably urges,) "in p. 6, of your letter, that you do not *believe* that the English Clergy are hypocrites, liars, or Socinians: but in answer to your assertion that you never *said* so, I beg leave to remind you, that whoever imputes to me a disbelief of those vital doctrines of the Gospel, the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement, calls me, not indeed *in terminis*, but by implication, a Socinian: and that whoever charges me with having given my solemn assent to articles of faith which I *utterly disbelieve*, calls me, not in so many words, but by inevitable consequence, a hypocrite and a liar. I must therefore continue to maintain, that you have stigmatized the Clergy with these opprobrious appellations, until you shall absolutely retract that offensive question, of which, at present, you have given no explanation whatever."—P. 26. *Bishop of Chester's Postscript to Third Edition of his Letter.*

We would suggest to Mr. Butler's consideration, whether he has not violated two of the rules of controversy: 1st. in charging the body of the Clergy with the supposed delinquencies of opinion of some individuals among them? 2dly. In forming his opinion of them from the sayings of an adversary?

We have nothing to say with respect to the declamation in favour of the Roman Catholics, which is tacked on as the

* Butler's Reminiscences, p. 3.

"*valete et plaudite*" of the work. It is quite irrelevant to the matter in hand.

The postscript however is really a curious document, and it may serve at once, as a specimen of Mr. Butler's Pamphlet, and of the force of his arguments.

"P.S. I have read the Postscript to the third edition of your Lordship's letter,—and I have read it with great concern, as it contains insinuations which I thought it impossible that a person of your learning and eminence could bring against the body to which I belong, or myself;—these, too, expressed in language which mine neither justified nor called for.

"I beg leave, however, to observe, that your Lordship has not justly conceived, and therefore not justly represented, the purport of the letter which I have had the honour of addressing to you. In the most explicit terms, I there say, that, to the charge which your Lordship brings against me, of accusing the established Church of solemnly attesting in their subscriptions of the thirty-nine articles, that, which they do not believe."—"I confine my present defence—to your Lordship's other charges" (and consequently to that of their not believing the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement) "I may perhaps reply at a future time. These are my words—I certainly had a right to confine my defence to one article, and to postpone, if I thought proper, my defence of all or any of the others. To that particular charge which you have now reproached me for not answering, I shall reply, when I shall have seen the publication which Doctor Southey has advertized. I mentioned this to your Lordship on the very outset of the discussion. For the present I shall only say, that, in respect to the discussion between us, the four articles, which your Lordship has specified, should not be detached from the thirty-nine." P. 30.

Here we learn, that a defence may be *confined* to an *universal negative*—that a charge relative to the whole of the articles may be denied without involving some of the articles—while, at the same time it is acknowledged, these particular articles are "not to be detached from the thirty-nine;" and that the author has so *confined his defence* after all, as, by his own confession, to have given no answer to the chief thing alleged against him.

A Sermon preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, February 20th, 1824. By the Right Rev. WILLIAM, Lord Bishop of Exeter; together with the Report of the Society for the Year 1823, &c. London. 1824.

(Continued from p. 304.)

THE necessity of episcopal superintendence in the American settlements soon attracted the notice of the Society. Earnest soli-

citations from different parts of the continent and the adjacent islands had indeed been, at the earliest period of its labours, transmitted to this country, that a Suffragan might be appointed to visit the several Churches, as well as administer the rites of Ordination and Confirmation. Accordingly in 1713, the Society having previously addressed the Queen on the subject, submitted to her Majesty the plan of an American Episcopate, in which it was stated as expedient that four Bishops should be appointed for the Colonies. As Burlington was judged a proper situation for one of the proposed sees, the Society purchased there, at the cost of 600*l.* specially contributed for that purpose, a house with a small domain annexed to it. Another of the sees was to be fixed at the island of Barbadoes, where it was proposed that the future Bishop should have the presidentship of the college, at that time about to be erected in the island, in pursuance of the will of General Codrington*.

The measure was on the point of being carried, when the death of Queen Anne put a stop to the proceeding. The

* Christopher Codrington was born in the island of Barbadoes in the year 1668. He received his education first at a private school, and afterwards removed to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1685, where having taken one degree in Arts, he was admitted Fellow of All Souls in 1689. Quitting the University, but retaining his fellowship, he entered into the army, and soon recommended himself to the notice of King William, by whom he was honoured with promotion. On the conclusion of the peace at Ryswick, he was appointed Captain General and Governor in Chief of the Leeward Caribbee Islands, in which he met with some trouble; for in 1701 several articles were exhibited against him to the House of Commons, but he was honourably acquitted from all imputations. In 1703 he was at the attack upon Gnadaloupe, in which he displayed great bravery, though the enterprize was unsuccessful. Some time before his death, he resigned his government, and retired to the enjoyment of a studious and learned course of life, which ended at his residence at Barbadoes, on Good Friday, April 7, 1710. He was buried in the Church of St. Michael, in that island, but his body was afterwards brought over to England, and interred in the Chapel of All Souls College, June 10, 1716. Latin orations to his memory were spoken by two Fellows of the College; the one by Digby Cotes, M.A. public orator of the University, at his interment; and the other on the following day, by the celebrated Dr. Young, then B.C.L. By his last will he bequeathed his own plantations in Barbadoes, and part of the island of Barbuda, to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for the purpose of building a College in Barbadoes; in which he appointed that a certain number of professors and scholars should be maintained, who are required to study and practise surgery and physic as well as divinity. He directed that the plantations should continue entire, and 300 Negroes at least be always kept on them. From a claim, however, made by Lieutenant Colonel Codrington, the executor, some delay occurred in obtaining this munificent benefaction; and the property was at the same time deteriorated through neglect, during the settling of the disputed claim. The French also made a descent on the island of Barbuda, and took off all the Negroes and most of the stock. These circumstances, together with the difficulty of procuring materials and workmen, prevented the intentions of the Founder from being realized in any immediate good result to the cause of Christianity.

attempt, however, was renewed in the beginning of the next reign, and with good prospects of success; but it proved abortive, from causes which are not fully known at this day—probably, among other reasons, from an excess in the conciliatory policy then adopted towards the Dissenters, and from the distractions which arose at home. The Society, notwithstanding these disappointments, still continued to have the object of sending out Bishops to America as a leading part of its designs and, with a view to the future accomplishment of it, under its auspices a fund was raised for that express purpose, to be employed whenever the times might favour it.

The activity with which infidel principles were propagated in America in the period following the first thirty years of the Society's incorporation, greatly impeded the exertions of the Missionaries in the different provinces, and also exposed their persons to considerable danger of persecution. But such was the diligence and moderation of the Clergy employed in this arduous mission, and such their constancy in spreading the blessings of the Gospel, that the Churches continued to increase in number, many of them in elegance of structure, and all in decency and order; insomuch that, as Bishop Terrick observed in 1764, "at the first opening of the Mission, only five Churches were to be found in the same extent of country which had the happiness to see them multiply to fifty times that number in the space of little more than fifty years." What a harvest then might not have been expected from the well-directed labours of the Society in cultivating those desert fields, had not the enemy so industriously sown tares among the wheat?

As the province of South Carolina was the first which sought and obtained the help of the Society, so it was the first in which the Society found occasion to suspend its missions, in consequence of its object having been so far effected as to render its support unnecessary—the legislature there in 1767 providing for the Incumbent of every parish by a yearly allowance of 100*l*. sterling. In the mean time a constant succession of Missionaries had been maintained there by the Society, and a well organized plan had been commenced at the suggestion of Mr. Garden, the Bishop of London's Commissary at Charlestown, for the instruction of the Negroes. A school was established in 1740—two Negro-boys having been first especially instructed under the immediate care of the Commissary, in order that they might act as school-masters to their fellow Negroes;—which was the happy means of educating a great number of that class. Before the school had been opened three years, no less than twenty-eight were dismissed from it as sufficiently educated, and twenty in each successive year—sixty children being daily

instructed, and at the same time fifteen grown slaves who attended in the evening when the labour of the day was over.

In 1746, the exertions of the Society were directed to the conversion of the Mosquitos, who had humbly solicited instruction in Christianity, by an application to the Governor of Jamaica. Missionaries were sent out for this purpose, though considerable impediments to the design arose from the difficulty of obtaining proper persons to undertake the office, and from the ill health of those who were sent. The King and Queen of the Mosquitos were baptized, and 120 Indians and Negroes, on the Mosquito shore.

In the Bahamas also, about the same time, a mission was established, which was productive of great benefit in diminishing the ignorance and licentiousness extensively prevalent in those islands.

In 1732, the Trustees of Georgia applied to the Society for a Missionary. To Mr. Quincey, who was first appointed for this service, succeeded in 1735, John Wesley*—the Society recommending the latter to the post, but the expense of his mission being defrayed by the Trustees. But another Missionary being also requested, others were successively sent with salaries from the Society, until 1771, when the provision made by the Local Government for the support of Clergymen removed the necessity of assistance from home. A Missionary, however, continued to be supported at Augusta, until the rebellion forced him to take refuge in the Bahamas. Fanaticism was at this time prevalent throughout Georgia, but it was greatly counteracted by the exertions of the Missionaries. Here also, in 1750, the Society concurred with the Associates of Dr. Bray in the support of a Catechist and Schoolmaster for the instruction of the Negroes. The prejudices, however, of the Negroes, their ignorance of the English language, and the continual labour to which they were subjected, operated in this case as strong barriers to their improvement.

The great discouragements encountered in the province of North Carolina by the first Missionaries, deterred others from undertaking the arduous duty. At length, in 1732, Mr. Boyd was appointed itinerant missionary there, and to him regularly succeeded others; and in 1750 a church was built at Edgcombe,

* Wesley was then thirty-two years of age. His answer to an unbeliever, who ridiculed, as Quixotic, the idea of his going out as a Missionary, when he had a good provision at home, was admirable—"Sir, if the Bible be not true, I am as very a fool and madman as you can conceive; but if it be of God, I am sober-minded. For he has declared, 'There is no man that hath left house, or friends, or brethren, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in the present time, and in the world to come everlasting life.'"—*Southey's Life of Wesley*, Vol. I. p. 76.

where the Missionary chiefly resided, and who had afterwards the fixed cure of a parish, with a stipend from the Government. The eastern division of the province was the seat of a separate mission, to which Mr. Garzia was appointed, and after his death Mr. Clement Hall, a respectable inhabitant and magistrate of the province, who, having received holy orders from the Bishop of London, returned to North Carolina as the Society's Missionary. The labours of the last were extraordinary—in travelling and preaching, and administering the communion and visiting the sick: and it is computed that he baptized, in the course of fifteen years service, no less than 10,000 persons. One circumstance is deserving of notice, as retarding the progress of religion in this province, that of the parochial ministers being annually appointed by the parishioners, who being in general men of dissolute lives, were not likely to retain a zealous and faithful Clergyman long amongst them. From the unfavourable circumstances of North Carolina, it followed upon the whole, that little success comparatively attended on the Society's endeavours there, and sectaries of every description consequently increased. The last Missionary here was Mr. Earl, who succeeded Hall, and who continued to receive the assistance of the Society until 1781.

In Pennsylvania, Missionaries continued to be regularly supported by the Society, until the disaffection towards the mother country broke out in acts of insubordination. One was also expressly appointed for the instruction of the Negroes, who discharged that duty until 1763. The Missionaries had here to struggle with the want of an established Church, and the consequent rivalry of aspiring sects, and with a spirit of anarchy fostered by infidelity on one hand, and enthusiasm on the other. The Society, therefore, was particularly careful in the instructions which it gave to them for their direction in this hazardous state of affairs; and its Missionaries acting upon these instructions, were signally distinguished for the zeal and the discretion with which they met the impending dangers and promoted the interests of Christianity, amidst the personal insults and risks to which they were exposed.

In New Jersey also, where, as in Pennsylvania, the government was administered by Quakers, and no support consequently was obtained to religion from the authority of the State; and it was owing chiefly to the active care of the Society, that the Church of England continued to maintain its ground. Until 1775, when the political disturbances broke out, Missionaries were supported at several stations—at Burlington—at Salem—at Elizabeth Town, where Dr. Chandler, who distinguished himself as an advocate for episcopacy, by a work enti-

tled, "An Appeal on behalf of the Church of England in America," was first the Society's Catechist, and afterwards its Missionary—and at Amboy and Trenton: the duties of the several Ministers at these places extending also to their respective neighbourhoods.

The growth of religion was strikingly evidenced in a charitable institution which took its rise here, for the widows and orphans of such of the American Clergy as should die in necessitous circumstances. At a general meeting of the Clergy at Elizabeth Town, in October, 1767, a Committee was appointed to meet at Amboy, in the following May, when a scheme was drawn up, which was adopted by the Clergy of the three provinces of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, and established by charter from the respective Governments. The Society having received an application for its countenance and assistance in the design, voted an annual contribution of 20*l.* for each province.

The Church of England had been established by the Government of New York in the city of New York. But the Society still provided Ministers for other parts of the province which required its aid, supporting no less than fourteen missions in different districts of it. One of its Missionaries here was Mr. Seabury, who, after the rupture of the States from the mother country, received consecration as Bishop of Connecticut, from the Bishops of Scotland. The school for poor children, established at New York, in 1709, continued to be supplied with Bibles, Common Prayers, Psalters, and Catechisms by the Society, which sent out its instructions to the Masters, with the prayers to be used by the scholars. To the original school another was added, for the education of twelve girls, at the expence of the Society; and this also obtained its assistance until the separation of the Colonies. Under its sanction and encouragement also, in 1755, the sum of 5000*l.* currency was raised in the province, for the purpose of establishing a College in New York. From the opposition made by the Dissenters, only half the sum raised could be obtained, and this was inadequate to the design. A voluntary contribution was then made by members of the Church of England in the province, to the amount of 2000*l.* and this being still insufficient, the Society, whose chief wish in promoting such an institution, was that Indian children might thus be educated for the conversion of their people, on receiving a memorial soliciting its aid, voted the sum of 500*l.* towards the building and support of the College, recommending it also to the further contribution of their friends. About the same time Dr. Bristowe, a member of the Society, died, and bequeathed to the

Society his library of nearly fifteen hundred volumes, for the use of the intended College at New York. A war with the Indians on the frontier prevented, however, that part of the design which related to the Indians from being prosecuted. This College at New York, as well as that at Philadelphia, afterwards received considerable benefactions from England, from the active interest shewn by Archbishop Secker, in obtaining a Royal Mandate for a collection in their behalf throughout England and Wales.

In New England we find also that several missions were supported by the Society until the period of American independence.

So also in Newfoundland its exertions were not intermitted, though the fluctuating nature of the population of that island operated as a great impediment to the progress of religion.

The town of Halifax, in Nova Scotia, was settled by three thousand families, conveyed there in 1749, at the charge of Government. On that occasion the Society received an intimation from the Lords Commissioners for trade and plantations, that it was intended to make provision in that province for the maintenance of religion, by allotting land for the endowment of churches and ministers and schoolmasters, and their charitable aid was desired in furthering this design. Two Missionaries were accordingly immediately sent there, and soon missions were appointed for other parts of the province. To facilitate the settlement of these missions, the Society, in 1769, sanctioned the formation of a corresponding Committee at Halifax, composed of the Lieutenant-Governor, the Chief Justice, and the Secretary of the province, all of them incorporated members of the Society. This Committee acted for a few years, and proved of considerable service; but it was found expedient to discontinue it, in consequence of differences which arose between it and the Missionaries. This province, and the town of Halifax in particular, received a great accession of population from those who fled thither from those parts of America which were agitated with political commotion. Amongst the emigrants to it were also many French and Swiss Protestants, for whom the Society provided Missionaries, sending over Bibles and Prayer Books, both in the French and high Dutch languages, and expressly printing a new edition of the Common Prayer in German, for the use of a congregation of Palatines. The success which attended these exertions was considerable; though they were in a great measure counteracted by the influence of the Romish Priests. The great care which had been taken by the Government at the settlement of this colony, for the due exercise of the Established Religion, with the concur-

ring assistance of the Society, proved the means of preserving this province in its allegiance, amidst the wide disaffection produced by the triumph of infidel and fanatical principles.

The instruction of the Negroes, as well as of the Indians, as it had formed part of the original design of the Society, was never abandoned amidst its continued labours for the good of the Colonists. A zealous Missionary, Mr. Thompson, who sought to be employed on that arduous service, was specially sent, in 1752, for the conversion of the Negroes in Africa, and he devoted himself with extraordinary perseverance to the work which he had nobly undertaken. At his suggestion the Society had three Negro boys sent over to England, who were sent to a school at Islington, and carefully instructed under the superintendence of a Committee. One of these was afterwards ordained by the Bishop of London, and returned to Africa as a Missionary to his brethren.

At the same time the system of instruction which had been commenced at New York, was prosecuted under the care of the Society; and a school for thirty Negro children was established in that city by the Associates of Dr. Bray, in 1760. The Negroes, who had received Christian instruction there, proved the most faithful servants during the disturbances which agitated New York at the period of political convulsion; and in consequence of the beneficial exertions in their behalf, a considerable congregation of Negroes existed, and we believe exists to this day, in that city, in communion with the Episcopal Church.

Nor was the conversion of the Indians neglected, but a succession of Missionaries was maintained. Through the active exertions of the persons employed in this mission, a congregation of Mohawks was formed, who had the Liturgy read to them in their own language; and the success was as great as could have been expected, in the tumultuary state in which these wild people subsisted, not only from their own desultory habits, but from the vexatious intermeddling of the Jesuits.

Do we admire, then, the present situation of the Church of England in the United States of America, and please ourselves with the expectation of the still greater eminence and prosperity to which it shall hereafter arise? let us look back with grateful recollection to the services of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, through whose instrumentality the American Church, under Divine Providence, was planted and watered, and put forth its earliest fruits. It may perhaps be going too far to say, that the Church of England would not have existed in the States without the support and aid of the Society; but this at least we may confidently assert, without fear of contradiction, that it would not have existed in

its present state of dignity and efficiency. It might have retained some followers who clung to it with filial fondness, and who would have wept in secret to have seen how sadly the walls of their loved Zion were dilapidated, and her fences broken down, by her degenerate sons: it would not have exalted its mitred head among the institutions of the New Republic, nor rallied its members around it with the voice of authority amidst the clamour of sectarian licentiousness. We should not have seen such men as Bishop White and Bishop Hobart, men of whom the American Church may justly feel proud, enjoying that civil honour and pre-eminence to which their merits have raised them; nor equally capable, therefore, of diffusing the blessings of that pure form of religion, which they at once profess and adorn.

After the secession of the States, the Society's labours were necessarily confined to Nova Scotia, Canada, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland. And it has been up to this day the main stay and support of the Church in those provinces. Its hopes and wishes have happily been realized there, in the establishment of episcopal superintendence, but it has no less continued to exert its own active supervision of the concerns of the American Colonial Church, and defraying the expense of the Missionaries employed. The present Report informs us that—

“There are now upwards of eighty Missionaries employed in their service, with considerable salaries attached to their appointments, disseminating the principles of Christianity in its purest form, through the several provinces of North America. Great assistance has also been extended, wherever applications have been made in the erection of Churches, and small salaries granted to a numerous body of Catechists and Schoolmasters. The people at large have been supplied with Bibles, Prayer Books, and religious tracts, as their wants have been made known.”

“Of late years, the National System of education has been introduced, under their patronage and auspices, into the three principal provinces dependant upon England, and the advantages already derived from it sufficiently prove its great influence in the improvement of the moral and religious character of the people. At Halifax, Nova Scotia, St. John's, New Brunswick, and at Quebec, establishments have been formed, which promise to be the means of spreading the knowledge of this powerful engine throughout the several provinces, of which these cities are the capitals; and will secure to the rising generation every facility for the more general instruction of the people at large.” P. 41.

But not only has the increased population of those Colonies made increased demands on the Society, but new scenes of exertion have been opened to it in India, in the south of Africa,

and the interior of New Holland, so that more than double the number of its present Missionaries would scarcely suffice to meet the exigencies of the times. The actual number of all its Missionaries engaged in different parts, we learn from the Report is one hundred and three, in addition to which a large body of schoolmasters is partially supported from its funds. To this number it is now proposed to add forty-nine Missionaries, and forty-eight schoolmasters, at the expence of 10,610*l.* exclusive of contingencies. But without, of course, a very great effort on the part of all members of the Church, of all who value the diffusion of Christian truth on true Church of England principles, it is impossible that these benevolent designs can be fulfilled without a very detrimental infringement of the present capital of the Society. Independently of the sum required for the support of additional Missionaries, the Society's views with regard to India must also be taken into consideration. A collection was made, it will be remembered, in 1819, under the authority of the King's Letter, for this special object, and applied to the use of Bishop's College, Calcutta: but in 1822, it was resolved to endow ten theological, and as many lay scholarships, together with an establishment of Missionaries, Catechists, and Schoolmasters in India—and to realize this scheme it was calculated that not less than 20,000*l.* were required.

"Under these circumstances, the Society intreat their friends to circulate, with increased activity, authentic details of the nature and extent of their operations, with a conviction that the British public will not fail to view the Corporation as the safest depository for their charitable contributions towards the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." P. 185.

The appeal, we sincerely trust, will not have been made in vain, but will call forth the energies of all, whether Clergy or Laity, in support of this venerable institution. It may not possess, indeed, the speciousness of some modern institutions—it may not hold forth to us such *imposing* language as that of saving *millions* from perishing everlastingly—it may not extend an indiscriminate embrace alike to the friend and foe of the Church—but it does call upon all who "pray for the peace of Jerusalem," to look back to what it has done for the cause of Christianity, and to believe from the past that any enlarged means of doing good in the same cause which may be confided to it, will be administered in the same spirit of piety and, zeal, and furthered by the same gracious Providence which has hitherto blessed its exertions, be productive of the like beneficial results. May it be the unanimous answer to the call—"Because of the house of the Lord our God I will seek thy good."

MISCELLANEOUS.

ARCHDEACON GLOVER'S PETITION IN FAVOUR OF
CONCESSION TO THE CATHOLICS.

(Circular Letter.)

Southrepps, April 18, 1825.

"DEAR SIR,

"The Question of Catholic Emancipation comes pressed upon by so many considerations, and from so many quarters—the justice and equity, as it appears to me, of the case itself, the peculiar circumstances both of this Country and of Ireland, as connected with it at the present moment, and *the enlightened judgment and sound discretion of our Diocesan*—that I am induced, late as it is, and contrary to my original intention, to invite those of my Clerical Brethren in the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, whose sentiments are in unison with my own, to join me in the public expression of such sentiments by presenting a Petition to Parliament in its favour; I regret that my short acquaintance with the District has enabled me to acquire but a very imperfect knowledge of the individual opinion of the Clergy upon this subject, and I must therefore throw myself upon their kind indulgence to excuse the liberty I take in addressing them thus indiscriminately. Should you be inclined to join me, I shall be obliged by your either attending without delay, for the purpose of signing the Petition, at the Registry in Bury, or transmitting your express authority to the Registrar, who will cause your signature to be attached for you. Should your sentiments be unfavourable to any further concessions to the Catholics, I have only to beg you to pardon the trouble I have given you, without expecting you to put yourself to the further inconvenience of an Answer—

"I am, dear Sir,

"Yours very faithfully,

"GEORGE GLOVER."

To the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

"The humble Petition of the Venerable the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, in the Diocese of Norwich.

"Sheweth,

"That whilst so many of their Clerical Brethren are presenting Petitions to both Houses of the Legislature in opposition to any further removal of those civil disqualifications under which that large body of our fellow subjects and fellow Christians attached to the ancient faith and discipline of the Church of Rome are still labouring both in Great Britain and Ireland, the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury whose names are hereunto subscribed, beg leave most humbly to approach your Lordships with the expressions of their views and sentiments also, on this important question.

"Alarms of danger to our own Church Establishment we observe to be the chief or sole argument upon which the Petitions above men-

tioned rest, but these alarms your Lordships present Petitioners are disposed to believe entirely groundless and imaginary, and they cherish this belief with greater confidence and satisfaction in as much as the contrary persuasion would require from them a melancholy confession, which they are not prepared to make—namely that the Pure and Primitive *system of faith and worship* to which they are fondly and conscientiously attached and which they have been ordained to minister, is only upheld by a support and influence which has no necessary connection with its positive merits, and can be no evidence either of its truth or excellence.

“Your Petitioners beg leave further to state that as civil proscriptions on account of religious opinions can never in any Christian community be less than religious persecutions, such proscriptions cannot be justified either in their origin or continuance, by any less measure of political necessity than would equally justify the suspension of the exercise of the first both of Christian charities and moral duties.

“In the instance of our Catholic Brethren, without venturing any opinion on the degree of necessity which dictated the original enactment of those penalties and disfranchisements under which they are suffering, and of which they so loudly complain, nothing appears to your Lordships Petitioners more clear than that they have at least been pursued far enough and tried sufficiently long—generation has followed generation, and they have neither conciliated allegiance nor produced conversion, they have often disturbed, instead of promoting public tranquillity, and endangered instead of ensuring the security of the State. On the other hand your Petitioners observe that no detriment has in any instance ever flowed from that course of relaxation and concession which has for more than twenty years been almost annually adopted by the Legislature, and which work of wisdom, charity, and justice your Petitioners humbly hope will this year find its full accomplishment; assured that nothing can so effectually tend to soften the asperities both of political and religious differences, to reconcile man to man, to promote the growth of general piety, and as an especial part of it, the prosperity and welfare of our own Established Church.

“To an enlightened and improved condition of society, to the tone and spirit of an age widely differing from those which have gone before it, and to their own individual exertions in their sacred calling, your Petitioners are persuaded may much more safely be trusted the progress of Divine Truth and of a correct estimate of civil obligations, than to any attempts to force them by acts of violence, or to guide them by any statutory restrictions, in matters which are scarcely cognizable by human laws.

“Lastly—Your Petitioners beg humbly to solicit the attention of your Lordships to a part of this question, which seems never to have its due weight in the discussion of Catholic Claims, namely, that the points of religious difference which separate the members of the Church of Rome from their fellow Christians of our own pale, are, when candidly examined, neither so many nor so great as the heat of party spirit, and circumstances of political emergency, have caused them to be considered; that they involve no point of doctrine

which the best and soundest Divines of the Church of England have held to be fundamental; and that in the mysterious tenet of Transubstantiation itself, when its definition, as set forth by the Romish Councils and highest individuals of that persuasion, is compared with the strong language of our own Articles and formularies of worship, there seems to your Petitioners, instead of its being made a touchstone for trying how far subjects of the same empire are fit to enjoy the same civil rights of society, to be barely sufficient discrepancy to prevent the respective parties from joining in religious communion.

"For these reasons, and mindful that we are Ministers of a Church, of which the broad and leading principle, as laid down at the Reformation, is an assertion of the right of conscience for every Christian Community, your Petitioners humbly hope that they shall be spared in future from presenting the strange inconsistency of pursuing in their own practice what they charge as a matter of accusation upon others, and be permitted to greet in the persons of their Catholic fellow subjects and fellow Christians, a body of men sharing the same duties, and enjoying the same privileges, and cherishing towards each other no other spirit of jealousy than which shall best manifest the influence of the faith and hope that is in them, by the observance of whatever is due to God, to their country, to society and to themselves."

We have inserted at full length the above Circular letter of the Venerable Archdeacon of Sudbury and the petition proposed by him to the Clergy of this Archdeaconry, in order to give our readers a fair opportunity of becoming acquainted with the contents, and history of a petition, every word of which, to the best of our recollection we heard read on the 17th ult. by His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex in the House of Lords, when he presented the petition. No one will suspect us of an improper desire to expose the weakness or the ignorance of dignitaries of our Church—but when all the weight which authority and rank are wont to give to the opinion of an individual, is publicly employed to propagate error and misrepresent the doctrines of the Church of England, we feel ourselves to be only discharging the duty of defending "the faith, which was once delivered to the Saints", when we endeavour to guard the unsuspecting and the ill-informed, from being led astray by such false statements of the differences in dispute between the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

With the Circular letter itself we have no wish to find fault, for though the purport of it be decidedly opposite to our own views on the subject of the Catholic Claims we should be the last to check the expression of the opinions which any portion of the Clergy may entertain on a question, which we believe to be intimately connected with the interests of the Protestant Church—Neither should we be very angry with the Archdeacon for insinuating to his Clergy that the prayer of the Petition is in accordance with the views of the Bishop of Norwich his diocesan, but we have good reason to object to the authority of the Bishop being so made use of to persuade the Clergy to sign a petition, which contains statements

of the nature of the Protestant religion, which the Bishop himself, as a Bishop of a Protestant Church, would be the first to disclaim. The Venerable Bishop Bathurst we know to be as mild, as candid, and as liberal as any of his subordinate clergy, but we should be shocked to conceive the possibility of his being as ignorant of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, as one of his Archdeacons shall presently be proved to be. In the second Paragraph the Archdeacon gravely tells us that "alarms of danger to our own Church Establishment are the sole arguments" of the Petitioners against further concessions to the Catholics; an argument which even if it stood alone and unsupported by fear of danger to the State as well as to the Church, we should have thought deserved some more powerful denial of its truth than that which the Archdeacon has been able to make. Admit the danger to the Church Establishment (argues the venerable divine) and you admit that the pure and primitive system of faith which the clergy are ordained to minister ("ministering system of faith") is upheld by a support and influence unconnected with its positive merits, and which is no evidence of its truth or excellence—an admission which is described as melancholy and which the Petitioners are unprepared to make. In this unwillingness to admit the consequence here stated to follow, we most heartily join. We neither admit it generally, nor as following by any fair deduction from the premises laid down. We have no alarms about the existence of our pure system of faith and worship, we believe that the faith of the Church of England is built upon a *Rock*, and that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it; that the Protestant faith should be rooted out by the labour of the Catholic clergy in the present day, would be a triumph of error over truth, for which we are quite unprepared. The question of the existence of a Protestant Established Church and the existence of the Protestant faith are perfectly independent of each other, but the Archdeacon has intermixed them in strange confusion together; in his premise he speaks of danger to the "Establishment" in his conclusion of danger to the "Faith" and in the confidence which we have in the divine origin and protection of the one, he would find an argument for the perpetuity of the other. We fear danger to the Church Establishment from the admission of Catholics into the Legislature, because the union of that Church with the State would then depend upon a Parliament still more insensible to the positive merits of the Church than the present House of Commons appears to be.

The Archdeacon goes on to talk about proscriptions and persecutions; but we decline arguing on the use of such words with a man who is weak enough to call a disability to legislate, a civil proscription: he might as well say when a Clergyman is refused a seat in the House of Commons, that he suffers religious persecution. With the morals of the Archdeacon we have more serious fault to find; for he seems to admit that there is "a measure of political necessity" which justifies the suspension of "the first of moral duties"—we trust however that the Archdeacon has in his zeal represented his opinion in a light unfavourable to himself.

We must hasten on to what may be termed the theological part of

this petition, but before we examine this strange mass of inconsistency and error, we must confess that our vision is too dull to enable us to foresee in the admission of Roman Catholics to Parliament that reign of peace, with the glories of which the Archdeacon appears almost enraptured. We do not see how political asperities can be softened or religious differences diminished by weakening the Protestant influence and increasing that of the Catholics, we do not see that Lord Thanet and Lord Lowther, Mr. Coke, and Colonel Wodehouse are made more friendly to each other, the nearer they approach to equality in power. We do not see that the growing wealth of the Catholics of the North of Ireland has produced more harmony with the Protestants, we do not see how "general piety will be promoted," when a Parliament of England shall allow the public endowment of Monasteries and Nunneries; and we are too sceptical to believe that "the prosperity and welfare of our established Church will be increased" by a multiplication of Roman Catholic Chapels, and by the exertions of members of the Monastic orders to gain Proselytes amongst the Members of our own communion.

Thus at length have we discussed the contents of the preamble to this petition of an Archdeacon of the Protestant Church of England in the nineteenth century—we have given the whole composition fair consideration, lest we should be suspected of quarrelling only with a detached passage, the meaning of which might appear otherwise when viewed in connection with the whole petition. And here we are prepared to shew that Mr. Archdeacon Glover is guilty of one of two faults; either of ignorance of the doctrines of the Church to which he has been appointed a leader and a guide—or of dissimulation. He is guilty of dissimulation, if knowing the strong line of demarcation which the Church of England has drawn in her articles between her own doctrines and those of the Church of Rome, he has deliberately defaced it;—he is guilty of ignorance, if the papers before us to which he attached his name, and requested the signatures of the Clergy within his jurisdiction, may be considered as an index to his knowledge, and a summary of his faith, as regards the controversy between the Catholic and Protestant Church. It is a fearful thing to the Established Church when the man who has the ear of his Sovereign, who is considered and worshipped by his followers as the most enlightened statesman of his days, who is surpassed by none in eloquence and unrivalled in his powers of ridiculing things serious or profane, in the face of the great council of a Protestant nation ridicules our differences with the Papists, and appeals to our Common Prayer Book for proof not indeed of our differences but of the points in which he asserts that we most nearly resemble each other. It is a fearful thing when Cabinet Ministers, and Laymen who have been for years acting under a belief that the Catholic religion is a dangerous and a false religion, by their recantation of their former professions give proof, that their knowledge of their own faith is as much founded on prejudice as was their aversion to that of the Catholics. Such statements as those of Dr. Doyle, and such works as those of Milner and of his shield-bearer Butler, can influence none in favour of

Catholicism but those who are ignorant of the principles of the Protestants. It is fearful when laymen err, how much more when dignitaries of a Protestant Church, conspire to spread the same errors, and from the very chair and place of authority proclaim, in the words of the Archdeacon's petition, "*that the points of religious difference between the Church of Rome and the Church of England are neither so many nor so great as the heat of party spirit and circumstances of political emergency have caused them to be considered—that they involve no point of Doctrine which the best and soundest divines of the Church of England have held to be fundamental!!!*"

In what school of Theology the Archdeacon has been instructed we are at a loss to discover; he appeals to the best and soundest divines of England with a degree of confidence, that would make a stranger to their works imagine that the Archdeacon must be conversant with them. Can he ever have heard of Jewell's famous Sermon at Paul's Cross, or of his Apology?—or of his controversy with Harding?—has he ever heard of Hooker and Andrewes, and Usher, and Bramhall, and Taylor, of Burnett, of Tillotson, of Barrow, of Wake, of Secker, of Pearson, of Chillingworth? Yes; he must have heard of their writings, but he cannot have read them, or he would not have ventured to assert of men, whose works abound with treatises directed against the errors of the Church of Rome, that those errors "involve no point of doctrine which the divines of our Church have held to be fundamental." Has Mr. Archdeacon Glover carefully studied the meaning of the 39 Articles, or is he amongst the number of those unhappy few, who are charged by Mr. Charles Butler with "subscribing those articles with a sigh or a smile." If he has studied them, how dare he have the hardihood to tell his subordinate Clergy, that the points of difference are not so great or so many as from "circumstances of political emergency" they have been considered. Does Mr. Glover know that the Church of Rome places her traditions on an equality with the Holy Scriptures, calling it *the unwritten word of God*? that the Council of Trent pronounced an anathema on those who disclaimed the authority of this unwritten word? and that Dr. Milner, (end of Controversy, p. 95.) has asserted, that to appeal to the Bible as an authority independent of the unwritten word of tradition, is to appeal to what is *a dead letter*? Surely, if there were no other difference, this would be as great as any that could be imagined; it amounts to this—the Protestants have one Bible, the Holy Scriptures; the Papists have two, the Scriptures, and tradition. Can any examination, however candid, make us think less of the falsehood of the Romish doctrines condemned in our Articles, such as relate to works of Supererogation, Purgatory, the adoration of the images of the Virgin Mary, and Invocation of the Saints? Can we admit that our disagreement in the number of sacraments is of a trivial kind? Can we become more reconciled to communion in one kind, and to the denial of the cup to the laity, the more we examine the authority on which it is refused? Is the doctrine of indulgences less at variance with the Scripture now than our Reformers thought it to be? Is the doctrine of the Sacrifice of Christ, and the offering up of him in the Mass, less destructive now of our belief in the efficacy of one oblation of Christ on the Cross, than it was two centuries since?

We do not see what the heat of party spirit and circumstances of political emergency, of which the Archdeacon speaks, has to do with the religious differences between the two Churches, in points of faith. Our articles were drawn up not in a day, or a week, or a year; and as to the Council of Trent, the decrees of which contain the present faith of the Catholic Church, that Council sat too many years to allow us to apologize for their maintenance of error, by saying that its decisions were formed in haste, or under the influence of such a party feeling as had not time to waste its superfluous strength in discussion. We would advise Mr. Archdeacon Glover to read over again his New Testament, to study again his Pearson, his Burnett, and his Wake's Catechism—and above all, we would recommend him to read the Articles and Homilies of his Church; and we venture to assert, that such a course of reading for six months, as he would recommend to one of those candidates for orders whom he has to present and examine in his official capacity as Archdeacon, would prevent his again displaying such ignorance of the doctrines of his Church, as might be thought to disqualify him from becoming one of the lowest of its deacons.

In the concluding part of the paragraph to which these animadversions are directed—there is both false doctrine and false statements—and we notice this the more particularly, because Mr. Canning is reported to have indulged in the same sophistical statement of the reasons, for which the declaration against Transubstantiation is required. It is a false statement to say that it is on account of any supposed influence of the mere doctrine of Transubstantiation upon the individual that the declaration against it is required, (and Mr. Canning and Mr. Glover must know this as well as ourselves) but because we are enabled to detect a Papist, by tendering to him such a declaration as if he be a Papist he cannot make. The Ephraimites were not put to death by Jephthah, because they said Sibboleth, the Sibboleth only pointed out who were Ephraimites; and so the Papist is rejected because he is a Papist, the belief in transubstantiation being the proof of his Papistry. If we did not refuse political privileges to the believers in Consubstantiation, it would not be because the one doctrine was harmless and the other hurtful, but because the Lutheran or Consubstantialist denies the Pope's supremacy, the Catholic or Transubstantialist maintains it.

Mr. Archdeacon Glover, in determining to enlighten his Clergy, thus states his opinion of the doctrine of transubstantiation; 'In the mysterious tenet of Transubstantiation, when its definition, as set forth by the Romish Councils and highest individuals of that persuasion, is compared with the strong language of our own Articles and formularies of worship, there is barely sufficient discrepancy to prevent the respective parties from joining in religious communion.' Surely the Archdeacon has forgotten the meaning of Transubstantiation; from these words any one would imagine that the difference in question is a mere quibbling about words. But what says the Council of Trent:—'If any one shall say, that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be accursed.' The bread and wine are no longer bread and wine—they have the colour, the smell, the taste, and all the other accidents pertaining to such substances; but they no

longer are such substances, a change has taken place into the very substance of the body and blood of Christ. Where will Mr. Glover find any doctrine like this in what he terms the strong language of our Articles and Formularies; will he find it in the 28th article, which contradicts the definition of the Council of Trent as plainly as any negative can contradict an affirmative? 'Transubstantiation, says our article, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.'

What says our Catechism, that 'a Sacrament is an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace;' the outward sign being in the Lord the bread and wine, the inward grace, the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper; but according to this very definition, it is not the natural body of Christ which is received, but inward and spiritual grace; our Church affirms that the body and blood are received really and indeed (*vere et reipsá*) by the faithful—but the words really and indeed, *vere et reipsá*, do not mean corporally and naturally; for the body and blood of Christ are the inward and spiritual grace of this Sacrament, and spiritual grace is any thing but a bodily substance. All then that the Catechism in these strong words affirms is, that the spiritual grace which our Lord promised under the outward signs of bread and wine, and which he called his body and blood, is really and truly here received: and that in opposition to the Romish Church, who denying the validity of our Sacraments, deny our receiving from them the spiritual graces promised in them.

The difference between our Church and the Catholics, on the subject of the Real Presence, may be thus stated: (Vide Bishop Taylor on the Real Presence.) We believe that we receive the body and blood of Christ, really but not naturally, not by any change of elements into Christ's natural body, really, but spiritually; not spiritually in the Catholic sense, after the manner of a spirit, but spiritually in the sense of present to our spirits only.

Much more might be said to vindicate our Articles and Formularies from the charge so ignorantly made of their being but slightly discrepant from the decisions of the Romish Councils. We shall only add one more observation; the Archdeacon declares that the discrepancy in our opinions on this head is barely sufficient to prevent our joining in religious communion; let him read the closing words of the 28th Article of our Church, and then turn to the decrees of the Council of Trent, (13th Session) and say how Churches holding such different opinions can unite in religious communion. 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, and worshipped.' So the Article. But what says the Council. 'They are anathematized who say, that Jesus Christ ought not to be adored in the Eucharist with the worship of Latria, and that this Sacrament ought neither to be honoured on a particular festival, nor carried in procession, nor exposed publicly to be adored, and who say, that those who adore it are idolaters.'

We take our leave of Mr. Archdeacon Glover, regretting sincerely that a regard to the honour of our Established Church, and our zeal in defence of what we believe to be the truth of the Gospel, would not allow us to pass by his proceedings without noticing them thus fully. We know how the Papists will triumph in the approbation of an Archdeacon of our Church. We know the use which they will make of it, and therefore we have stepped forward thus decidedly to warn the Roman Catholics against concluding, that the body of the Protestant Clergy have adopted the sentiments of Mr. Glover. Some few, who are, as ignorant of the points of difference between the two Churches as the Archdeacon of Sudbury is, may be found ready to advance the views of the Catholic priesthood, but the Catholics may rest assured that such ignorance as his is not universal, nor even common; and we are disposed to believe, that in the instance before us, the political attachments of the Archdeacon have weakened his judgment, and corrupted his theological opinions, and have made him overlook, we hope unintentionally, that which at one period of his life, when he became a minister of the Church of England, he must have known to be the truth.

NEW CHAPEL AT PRINCE'S RISBOROUGH.

A CHAPEL has been recently erected for the use and benefit of three distinct villages, containing above 800 persons, four miles from the church, in the parish of Prince's Risborough, in the county of Buckingham and diocese of Lincoln, which extends nearly nine miles from north to south. This district is situated on the lofty range of the Chiltern Hills, and the parish church in the vale beneath, to which but few of the young, the aged, or the infirm can often resort.

The Incumbent, after various difficulties and much opposition, successfully arranged a plan, with the sanction and liberal support of his Diocesan, to build and endow a parochial chapel by voluntary contributions, at the central hamlet of Lacey's Green, and gave an acre of his glebe for the site and a circumjacent cemetery. The Lord of the Manor (John Grubb, Esq.) freely conveyed eighteen acres of freehold land as an endowment, to procure the consecration of the edifice, which has been augmented by nine acres adjoining, purchased with a contribution from Lord George Henry Cavendish, M. P. the chief proprietor in the district, bestowed specifically for that purpose.

The structure is from a chaste gothic design of the time of Elizabeth, presented by John Norris, Esq. F.A.S. who accompanied it with a very liberal donation, and became one of the trustees. It has been very substantially erected, and contains 500 persons, allowing 20 inches for each sitting, whereof 440 are to be free and unappropriated, in consideration of £460 having been contributed in aid of the undertaking by the "Society for promoting the enlargement and building of Churches and Chapels." It is judged that the general appearance of the building will be much improved by a small tower being substituted for the present porch at the west end, as was suggested by some friends of the undertaking, and afterwards contemplated by the Trustees, had their finances proved adequate. A room for the Sun-

day School was to have been provided herein, a great desideratum in that secluded and hitherto neglected spot.

Many of the Nobility, and Gentry of the country, subscribers to this work of piety, have presented their coats of arms in stained glass, to decorate the east window, and to testify to future generations their munificence in contributing to the erection of this sacred edifice. And if from the specimen which has been given an opinion may be formed of the whole effect, it may be pronounced that the window, when completed, will be a beautiful production of modern art. It is however, painful to add, that a very considerable debt has been incurred beyond the fund created by the donations: but we trust that individual benevolence towards this act of lasting charity—perpetuating to generations yet unborn, the greatest spiritual blessings that can be bestowed on man,—the knowledge of a God and Saviour, and the way of Salvation,—will not be solicited in vain.

The inhabitants of this district, chiefly poor labourers, hitherto living in almost heathen ignorance, spending the Sabbath day in idleness and in neglect of all religious duties, will, by a Minister becoming resident among them, most effectually be induced to reform their moral character; and the stability and prosperity of the established church will, at the same time, be promoted by the instruction of the rising generation, in this edifice constructed by the pious beneficence of private individuals, for the public worship of Almighty God.

LETTER ON THE UNITARIAN MARRIAGE BILL.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,

It has excited much surprise in the minds of many of the Clergy, that the Archdeacon of Canterbury should, in his charge to them, within these few days, have spoken of the Bill, now in progress through Parliament, for the marriage of Unitarian dissenters in their own chapels, in a way that leads them to suppose that he is favourable to the measure. I confess, I heard with regret that part of his Charge in which the subject was mentioned. His reason for thinking that the measure might be conceded was this—that it had been granted to Jews and Quakers. But the case of the Jews, who are foreigners, and the Quakers, a syon very properly observed in your last Number, is by no means parallel. The Quakers have always been a quiet, unobtrusive body of men, neither desirous of making proselytes, nor rendering themselves conspicuous in political matters, nor shewing any hostility to the Established Church. If the Archdeacon could make out a similar case on the behalf of the Unitarians, the Clergy might be able to discover not only a parallel, but also a reason for his opinion, and for their coinciding with it. As it is, facts are decidedly in collision with such a supposition. I am myself a Clergyman in a parish in which there is a large congregation of Unitarians, who have been ever most violently opposed to the government both in Church and State, and who endeavour by all possible means to undermine and subvert both.

There is scarcely an opportunity occurs in which they do not strive to force themselves into the management of parish affairs, and exclude the members of the Established Church. They entertain the bitterest hostility, and leave no occasion unused of venting their rancour, against both the Church and the Clergy. The Archdeacon (fortunately for him) has no such examples in his own parish, and he is therefore, I presume, perfectly unacquainted with the spirit with which those dissenters are actuated. They will, I doubt not, when they are acquainted with his opinion, praise him for his liberality; but they would rejoice in the subversion of the Church of which he is so orthodox and sound a member and advocate, and in seeing him and his brethren deprived of their dignities and preferments. I would not have the Archdeacon deceived on this point. The Unitarians are plausible and insinuating, and on that account the more dangerous. They are a political, rather than a religious sect, so far as I can discover—radicals to a man. And it may be remarked that radicals in politics generally either become infidels altogether, or, by way of saving their credit in some degree, turn Unitarians.

Where then is the parallel between this sect and the Quakers? I am at a loss to discover it; and so, I believe, are most of the Clergy in this diocese. But grant them this point, and what then? Will they be satisfied? Will they become loyal and peaceable members of the community? Unquestionably not! They will only acquire new confidence; and, considering themselves to have obtained a *footing* within our sanctuary, they will leave nothing untried to obtain a perfect possession, to the exclusion of the present possessors. It may be said that their doctrines are too absurd to prevail with the majority of the population. They may be so. But why give them such a sanction as will enable them to *unsettle*, and eventually to *destroy*, the faith of *many*, if not the major part of our population? I know the Unitarians too well, and I know also the perverseness of human nature too well, to believe that the present measure, if carried, would reduce them to that state of insignificance and contempt, which some of its advocates are led to imagine. Can any Act of Parliament so define an Unitarian as to prevent those who are not professedly such from resorting to their chapels for the solemnization of marriage? There are thousands who are of no religion at all, and who hate the Established Church and her Clergy on that account as much as the Unitarians do. There are many dissenters also, who, though not Unitarians, are so decidedly hostile to the Church, that they would unite in any measure that might shew their hatred, provided that the forms used did not amount to a direct renunciation of their principles—and of this the Unitarians would take good care.

Marriage, as the Archdeacon justly said, is a civil contract. We have added to it the sanction of religion; but it is not absolutely necessary to its validity, nor is the form material. Of this, not only dissenters, but many who call themselves churchmen, if they happened to dislike the Clergyman, or take offence at any trivial occurrence, would avail themselves; and, regardless of the form, so their perverse wills were gratified, and the marriage legal, they would solemnize the contract in the Unitarian meeting-house. But what a source of pro-

selytism would this become! The parties, once there, would be plied on all hands; and the ill-informed and the badly disposed would invariably become converts to the blasphemous tenets of these unchristian sectarians.

I know I shall be told that I am castle-building. But surely it is not unwise to judge of the future by the past! From the days of Priestley they have been an increasing sect: and it is a notorious fact that many of the congregations in England, formerly belonging to the Scotch Kirk, have embraced Unitarian tenets. But let me direct your attention a little farther. Look to what the Unitarians are doing in our foreign possessions. We have sent a Bishop to Calcutta and two to the West Indies, for the purpose of propagating the Gospel, and establishing an apostolical form of Church government. What have the Unitarians done in consequence? They have endeavoured, as far as they were able, to defeat these designs. While our amiable Archdeacon (to his credit be it spoken) is patronising a new diocesan committee of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, with a view of aiding the great work these Bishops are sent out to effect, the Unitarians are striving to counteract it, by sending out their Missionaries also. And it is a fact that they are, at this present time, engaged in the erection of a large chapel at Calcutta, for which they have there raised upwards of 1000*l.* and are soliciting subscriptions in every part of England—as may be seen by a reference to the covers of a magazine called the “Theological Repository,” for the last few months.

Where then, I would again ask, does the parallel exist between the Unitarians and the Quakers? The one a turbulent, troublesome, insinuating, intermeddling, rivalling, and ambitious sect; the other quiet, peaceable, and unobtrusive. Let the Legislature, then, beware how they rashly give their sanction to this measure, lest they lay the foundation of a terrible enmity which shall one day crush the glorious liberty we now enjoy in matters both civil and ecclesiastical.

Your's, &c.

May, 1825.

CLER. CANTUAR.

LINES ON MR. RENNELL.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,

As I perceive that you admit poetry into the work under your direction, I send you a tribute to the memory of the late Mr. Rennell. The subject will not, I conceive, be thought unseasonable, and where can it find a more appropriate place than in the *Christian Remembrancer*?

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Z.

Rennell, within a busy sphere,
Your's was a bright tho' short career.
We joy to think how much was done,
While through your course you quickly run.
The mark'd respect which crown'd your close
Your worth pre-eminently shows:

For not your flock alone combin'd
 In this, but alien pastors join'd
 By strongest evidence to prove
 Their grief, their reverence, and love.
 This, spite of sorrow, still must shed
 Balm on a parent's wounded head,
 But for thyself—exalted thou
 Art far beyond the influence now
 Of such poor soothings: can they bless
 Him who now dwells in happiness?
 Yet while you linger'd here below
 A joy there was, to ease that blow
 Which fell upon thee, like a blast,
 The sorest trial, and the last—
 A joy there was—for him who trod,
 Beneath thine eye, the path of God,
 'Twas thine to place, a refuge for his age,
 "In a fair ground, a goodly heritage,"
 Nor less this comfort must console,
 As life ebb'd out, thy fainting soul,
 That e'en those moments, by some giv'n
 To ease, thou gavest up to heav'n:
 No claims of sickness a reprieve
 From toil could win, or thou receive:
 To gain the infidel, and keep
 Within Christ's fold his wandering sheep,
 Was still thy care—thy witness be,
 Thy glorious witness, Struensee!
 Thus, a true soldier of the Christian band,
 Rennell, you death encounter'd, sword in hand.

 METRICAL PRAYER.

To the Editor of the Christian Remembrancer.

SIR,

If you think that the following lines may be inserted with advantage in the *Christian Remembrancer*, they are much at your service.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

X.

Holy Father, unto Thee
 Humbly I would bend the knee.
 For my blest Redeemer's sake,
 On thy suppliant pity take,
 May the Holy Spirit's aid
 Be my shield and buckler made!
 O! may He his grace impart
 To cleanse and regulate my heart!
 Lively faith may He bestow!
 Hope, which bids the bosom glow!

Charity, that seeks to bind
In bonds of love all human kind!
Lowliness, to banish pride!
Patience to Faith and Hope allied!
Purity with heav'n conversing!
Piety thy deeds rehearsing!
Firmness in thy truth's defence,
And fortitude may He dispense!
These things, Father, I implore—
But for this world's fading store,
What Thou wilt to assign,
That and only that be mine!
For well I know that I shall share,
If faithful, thy parental care;
And that thy bounty still will flow,
To yield me all I want below.
Holy Father, day by day,
Teach me when and how to pray.

MONTHLY REGISTER.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LINCOLN'S INN-FIELDS.

THE important question adjourned at the former General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, respecting the transfer of the superintendence of its East India Missions to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, was brought under the consideration of the last General Meeting, by a very luminous report from the Standing Committee, in which the rise and progress of the Society's East Indian relations were explained, together with the many advantages which would accrue to this department of its concerns from the proposed assignment, by bringing the several Missions into immediate connection with Bishop's College, and producing a unity of Missionary exertions in that part of the world, under the management of a Society, from its constitution and circumstances, much better calculated to perform the important service with energy and effect.

The recommendation of the Committee was unanimously agreed to, and it was resolved to make an immediate tender of the Society's East Indian Missions to the Sister Society, accompanied with the communication, that during the lives of the existing Mis-

sionaries, the usual allowances would be continued.

The report of the Standing Committee further brought under the notice of the Board another subject of great and increasing interest, the Indian Native Schools, of which the Society's Missionaries were the original founders; and which, since the formation of Diocesan Committees, by Bishop Middleton, at the three Presidencies, have been under the sedulous superintendence of those useful auxiliaries; and recommended that the Society's care and bounty should now be turned specially to their encouragement and increase, and that for the bringing this great object more permanently before the friends of the Society at home, and for its more effectual prosecution, a separate fund should be established; towards the formation of which, in the event of its being agreed to, a munificent individual (whose name was not disclosed) had tendered 1000*l*.

This recommendation of the Committee was also unanimously agreed to; and it was resolved to make an immediate grant of 5000*l*, to that specific object, as an expression of the Society's conviction of its extreme importance.

BISHOPSGATE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Established January, 1824.

Patron.—The Rt. Hon. and Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of London.

President and Treasurer.—The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chester, Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate.

Committee.—Rev. W. Parker, M.A. Rev. J. Blenkarne, M.A. Rev. J. J. Ellis, M.A. Rev. R. Harvey, M.A. Rev. G. Tomlinson, B.A. Mr. Bannatyne, Mr. A. Clarke, Mr. Cotesworth, Mr. Grellier, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. J. D. Powles, Mr. Richards.

Secretary.—The Rev. Richard Harvey, M.A. 52, Liverpool Street.

Extract from the First Annual Report.

At the First Anniversary Meeting of the Subscribers and Friends of the Bishopsgate District Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, holden at the School House, Peter Street, Sun Street, on Wednesday, the 23d of March, 1825, The Lord Bishop of Chester, Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, in the Chair.

The following Resolutions were unanimously passed :

On the Motion of Sir William Blizard, seconded by John Bannatyne, Esq.

"That it appears, by the Report just presented to this meeting, that the labours of the Bishopsgate District Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the past year have been eminently useful, in circulating among the poorer classes of this neighbourhood the Holy Scriptures, and other books containing sound religious, and moral instruction."

On the Motion of J. D. Powles, Esq. seconded by Henry Salkeld, Esq.

"That the establishment of District Committees, or branches of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, appears to be a powerful means of furthering and extending the important objects of the Parent Society, by making those objects more generally known, by promoting an intercourse between the parochial Clergy and the Laity, and by presenting a point of union for the friends of sound religion, and especi-

ally the members of the Established Church."

On the Motion of Robert Cotesworth, Esq. seconded by John Richards, Esq.

"That among other important advantages arising from the establishment of district committees, the communication to which it leads with the poorer classes, on the subject of their spiritual wants, deserves to be specially enumerated; and that on these and other grounds the Bishopsgate District Committee of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge is entitled to the warm and continued support of this meeting."

On the Motion of John Bannatyne, Esq. seconded by Arthur Clarke, Esq.

"That the thanks of this meeting be respectfully presented to the Lord Bishop of Chester, Rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, President and Treasurer of this Institution, for his continual attention to its interests."

On the Motion of John Richards, Esq. seconded by J. D. Powles, Esq.

"That the thanks of this meeting be presented to the Rev. Richard Harvey, M.A. Secretary of this Institution, for his constant and unwearied exertions in discharging the duties of that office."

It is with great satisfaction that the District Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in the Ward of Bishopsgate present to the Subscribers this first Annual Report of their proceedings—a report, which, it is hoped, will be found to contain matter of interesting concernment to the friends of religion in general, and particularly to members of the Established Church.

An opinion was expressed, at the first formation of this Committee, that the *gratuitous* distribution of Bibles, Prayer Books, and Religious Tracts was less desirable than the *sale* of them at *very reduced prices*; for it is well known, that the poor set a greater value upon that which they have purchased out of their honest earnings,

than upon that which comes to them, perhaps unasked, but at all events unbought. Add to which, that their readiness to buy even at a low price, proves their desire of possessing. At the same time, regarding the word of God as absolutely necessary to every Christian who can read it, your Committee by no means approve of exacting from the poor a greater price for Bibles and Prayer Books than is sufficient to give them a certain feeling of property in the books which they buy; and therefore it was recommended, at the commencement of this undertaking, that the reduced prices of the books on the Society's catalogue, should be still further reduced, for sale amongst the poor of this district, by means of a fund formed by donations. The result has been very encouraging. The poor have evinced great alacrity in purchasing the books offered to them on these terms; and the whole number of Bibles, Testaments, and Common Prayer Books, which your Committee have distributed, with the exception of two Bibles and two Common Prayer Books, have been sold at the reduced prices. The smaller tracts have been in some instances sold, and in many given, to the purchasers of Bibles and Prayer Books. The following is the account of Books which have been issued from the Committee's depository within the last year:—

Bibles	215
Testaments	126
Common Prayer Books ...	355
Books and Tracts.....	890

Forming a total of .. 1586

Of these, one Welsh Testament and four Welsh Prayer Books have been sold; four Testaments have been sold to Roman Catholics, and two Prayer Books to a Roman Catholic for his Protestant wife and child. Two hundred and eighty-three of the Tracts have been issued to the Sunday Schools now established in this parish for the reception of those children who are not able to attend the daily National Schools; and the Committee may be excused for taking this opportunity of expressing their anxious wish, that these Sunday Schools, which are at pre-

sent wholly conducted by gratuitous teachers, may be more generally known, and better supported.

In stating the number of books which have been distributed, in a district of limited extent the Committee wish to remind the subscribers, that, independently of the good which must always result from placing the word of God in the hands of a person who is desirous of receiving it, a great advantage accrues to the cause of religion through its ministers, when the Clergy are made the instruments of conveying that blessing to the poor. While prosecuting an inquiry into the spiritual wants of their flock, they become acquainted with many interesting and important facts, and find many unlooked for opportunities of doing good. The very circumstance of their being seen so employed, is a sensible proof of the concern which they feel for the welfare of their charge, "as they that must give account," a proof which is generally appreciated as it deserves to be. It is matter of fact, that in this district many poor persons, while taking in religious books, have directed the attention of their clergyman to cases of distress and sickness in their neighbourhood; and, what is more important still, many, who had never attended any place of worship, having been induced to purchase a Bible or a Prayer Book, have ever since gone regularly to church; indeed there has been a sensible increase in the attendance of the poor at church since the institution of this Committee. Being made acquainted with the testimonies of the Lord, they have learned to love the courts of his house. Were there only one well-attested instance of this sort, it might justly be considered as a sufficient return for the bounty of those who support this institution, and for the labours of those by whom that bounty has been dispensed.

It must not be forgotten, that while it was one object of this Committee to provide for the spiritual wants of their immediate neighbourhood, another was to contribute to the general designs of the Society itself; to throw its mite into that treasury, the contents of which may truly be said to be dedicated to the service of the Lord's house.

Accordingly, the sum of 76*l.* 1*s.* 2*d.* has been paid to the Society's treasurers, being one-third of the Donations and Subscriptions received by the District Committee: and, in addition to this, the sum of 16*l.* 2*s.* 3*d.* being one-third of the money for books sold within the District—so that, on the whole, this Committee has contributed, within the last year, 92*l.* 3*s.* 5*d.* to the general designs of the Society.

Having thus laid before the Subscribers a brief, and, it is hoped, a satisfactory account of the purposes to which their liberality has been applied, and of its results, the Committee have great pleasure in being able to state, that the Society itself, in whose cause they are engaged, continues to increase in numbers and in usefulness. As it is better known, it is more esteemed;—esteemed as an efficacious and trust-

worthy instrument, by which the Church is enabled to supply the labouring classes of this nation with the materials and means of religious knowledge, qualifying them (under the blessing of God, attending upon the ministry of their appointed teachers) to build up their faith upon a sure foundation, and to understand the nature of their obligations to Him, "who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

That He may bless the labours of his servants in the work of converting souls, and day by day enlarge the boundaries of his kingdom upon earth, will be the constant prayer of all who feel the power of his Gospel in their own hearts.

Receipts and Payments of the Bishopsgate District Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

RECEIPTS.				PAYMENTS.			
1824	£.	s.	d.	1824.	£.	s.	d.
Donations and Subscriptions.....	228	3	6	Society for Books	75	18	2½
Sale of Books	48	6	8½	Ditto one-third Donations and Subscriptions.....	76	1	2
				Ditto one-third proceeds of Sale of Books	16	2	3
				Mr. Norris for Stamp and Ink..	1	18	6
				Mr. Clay for printing	5	5	0
				Balance in hand.....	101	5	1
	£276	10	2½		£276	10	2½
1825	£.	s.	d.	1825	£.	s.	d.
Balance in hand....	101	5	1	Society for Books	45	8	8½
Sale of Books	15	18	6	One-third proceeds of Sale of Books	5	6	2
				Mr. Clay for printing	1	19	0
				Balance in hand.....	64	9	8½
	£117	3	7		£117	3	7

List of annual Subscribers amounts to nearly 150.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

THE communication from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (with regard to the transfer of the East India Mission) mentioned p. 375, was laid before the Board and the proposal contained in it unanimously

assented to; and thus the plans of Bishop Middleton are completed and Bishops' College made the centre of all the Missionary operations of the Church of England in India.

Amongst other interesting subjects

of discussion the attention of the Board was very urgently called by Bishop Inglis to the present state of King's College, at Windsor, in Nova Scotia. This institution was founded by his late Majesty, shortly after the termination of the American revolution, and co-eval with the erection of the Province into an Episcopal See for the purpose of diffusing amongst its inhabitants generally the benefits of a Church of England education and training up a native ministry—the importance of which objects were then very strongly felt. Forgetfulness of the past, has induced neglect of this establishment to proceed to that extent that the edifice is fallen into complete decay; whilst rival institutions have sprung up and obtained that public counte-

nance and support which its superintendants have solicited in vain. The case as made out by the Bishop produced that impression upon the Board, that 500*l.* was voted towards its restoration, and more complete appointment with Professors, though the Society have no other means to make this grant than by a further reduction of its principal, a recommendation to the Christian Knowledge Society was also unanimously agreed to, to take the case into their favourable consideration, and a subscription was opened to further the design which His Grace the President, and the Bishop of London, commenced by donations of 100*l.* each, and to which several others of the members present made liberal contributions.

BISHOPSGATE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Established April, 1824.

THE Bishop of Chester is really indefatigable in furthering the concerns of Religion and of the Church. Not only did he, early in 1824, establish in his parish a District Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Know-

ledge—with what success, the above sketch of the First Report will sufficiently testify—His Lordship commenced a similar Association in aid of the Sister Society. The following is a list of the Subscribers:—

	Don. £. s. d.	Ann. S. £. s. d.
1822 Chester, Right Rev. C. J. Lord Bishop of, Rector, President & Treasurer (Incorporated).....	—	2 2 0
1824 A Lady, by the Lord Bishop of Chester	5 0 0	—
Bannatyne, J. Esq. New Broad-street	—	1 1 0
1825 Campbell, Mrs. Berners-street	—	1 1 0
Campbell, Miss do.....	—	1 1 0
1824 Clarke, A. Esq. Bishopsgate-street	—	1 1 0
Clode, G. Esq. do.....	—	1 1 0
Clode, Mrs. do.....	1 1 0	—
Cotesworth, R. Esq. Broad-street Buildings	—	1 1 0
Danbuz, Mrs. M. New Broad-street.....	5 0 0	—
De Lisle, Mrs. Devonshire-square	—	1 1 0
Harvey, Rev. R. Curate, Secretary (Incorporated)...	—	2 2 0
Headington, Mrs. Spitalfields	—	1 1 0
Hurry, E. Esq. Burton-crescent	—	1 1 0
1825 Judkins, J. R. Esq. Bishopsgate-street	—	0 10 6
1824 Meyer, J. C. Esq. Broad-street Buildings	10 0 0	—
Otte, W. Esq. Walbrook-house	—	1 1 0
Patten, Miss, Wormwood-street	—	1 1 0
Patten, Miss M. do.	—	1 1 0
Patten, Miss A. do.	—	1 1 0
Powles, J. D. Esq. Freeman's-court	5 5 0	1 1 0
Powles, A. W. Esq. do.	10 0 0	1 1 0
Purrier, J. V. Esq. St. Helen's-place	—	1 1 0
Richards, J. Esq. Devonshire-square	—	1 1 0
Simpson, D. Esq. Bishopsgate-street	—	1 1 0

	Don.	Ann. S.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
1824 Scott, John, Esq. New Broad-street	—	1 1 0
Tomlinson, Rev. G. Curate	—	0 10 6
Wilson, T. Esq. M.P. Jeffrey's-square	10 0 0	—
Wilson, M. Esq. Walbrook-house	—	1 1 0
1825 Wilson, Miss, do.	—	1 1 0
Wilson, Miss M. do.	—	1 1 0
Wyndham, E. Esq. Charlotte-street	—	1 1 0

ADDITIONAL LIST.

1825 Alston, Mr. Bishopsgate-street	1 0 0	—
Barrett, Mrs. do.	—	0 5 0
Barrett, Miss do.	—	0 5 0
Beales, Mr. do.	—	0 5 0
Belfour, Mrs. New Broad-street	—	0 5 0
Bell, J. P. Esq. Broad-street Buildings	—	1 1 0
Bell, Thomas, Esq. New Broad-street	—	1 1 0
Bell, Miss, New Bond-street	—	1 1 0
Berwick, Mrs. Rose and Crown-court	—	0 5 0
Bourcard, Mr. Broad-street Buildings	0 10 0	—
Brown, Mr. Houndsditch	—	0 5 0
Burrows, Mrs. Broad-street Buildings	—	0 5 0
Chambers, D. Esq. Bishopsgate-street	—	1 1 0
Clay, Mr. Devonshire-street	—	0 5 0
Clayton, Rev. John, Devonshire-square	1 0 0	—
Cobb, Dr. Finsbury-circus	—	0 5 0
Coggar, Mrs. Walthamstow	—	0 5 0
Champion, Mrs. Wandsworth	1 1 0	—
Champion, Miss. do.	1 1 0	—
Champion, Miss E. do.	1 1 0	—
Crespin, Mrs. Bishopsgate-street	—	0 5 0
Daubuz, Mrs. A. New Broad-street	2 0 0	—
Doxat, A. J. Esq. Bishopsgate-street	—	1 1 0
Doxat, Mrs. A. J. do.	—	1 1 0
Doxat, Miss do.	—	0 10 6
Dyke, Mrs. New Broad-street	—	0 5 0
Edger, Miss, Devonshire-square	—	0 5 0
Edger, Miss M. do.	—	0 5 0
Edix, Mr. Broad-street Buildings	—	0 5 0
Forbes, Mr. do.	—	0 5 0
Gilbert, J. Esq. Bishopsgate-street	—	1 1 0
Grellier, P. P. Esq. Wormwood-street	—	1 1 0
Groves, Miss, Bishopsgate-street	—	0 5 0
Hankey, Miss Emma, Bedford-square	—	0 5 0
Hare, Mrs. Bishopsgate-street	0 10 6	—
Heard, Mr. Liverpool street	—	0 5 0
Hichens, R. Esq. Threadneedle-street	10 10 0	1 1 0
Holborn, Mr. Bishopsgate-street	—	0 5 0
Huff, Miss, do.	—	0 5 0
Jeffery, Miss A. Walbrook	—	1 1 0
Kimber, Mrs. Bishopsgate-street	—	0 5 0
King, Mr. S. Half Moon-alley	—	0 5 0
Lee, Mrs. Pavement	—	0 10 0
Lee, Miss, do.	—	0 5 0
Lee, Miss A. M. do.	—	0 5 0
Lee, Mrs. John, Upper Clapton	—	1 1 0
Litwall, Mr. Bishopsgate-street	—	0 5 0

	Don.	Ann. S.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
March, Mr. New Broad-street.....	—	0 5 0
Mathews, James, Esq. Ixworth, Suffolk.....	—	1 1 0
Meyer, Mrs. Broad-street Buildings.....	1 0 0	—
Moore, Mr. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 5 0
Morley, W. Esq.	—	1 1 0
Morley, Mrs. W.	1 0 0	—
Morley, Mr. James.....	1 0 0	—
Muspratt, J. P. Esq. New Broad-street.....	—	1 1 0
Newman, Mr. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 5 0
Norris, Mrs. Blomfield-street.....	—	1 0 0
Osborn, Mr. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 5 0
Pead, Mr. B. Broad-street Buildings.....	—	0 10 0
Phillips, Mrs. G. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 5 0
Powell, J. C. Esq. St. Helen's-place.....	—	1 1 0
Powell, James, Esq. Hackney.....	—	1 1 0
Richards, Mrs. Devonshire-square.....	—	1 0 0
Richards, Miss, do.	—	0 10 0
Ronaldson, Mr. Liverpool-street.....	—	0 5 0
Royston, Mr. Broad-street.....	—	0 5 0
Salkeld, Mrs. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 5 0
Sikes, William, Esq. Mansion House-street.....	—	1 1 0
Smith, Mr. D. Bishopsgate Church-yard.....	—	0 5 0
Tayler, Mr. Sun-street.....	—	0 5 0
Terrill and Nell, Messrs. Broad-street Buildings.....	—	0 10 6
Thomas, Mr.	0 10 0	—
Upton, Mr.	0 10 0	—
Varty, Mr. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 10 0
Vernon, — Esq. Broad-street Buildings.....	—	1 1 0
Waite, Mr. Wormwood-street.....	—	0 5 0
Wells, Mr. Bishopsgate-street.....	—	0 10 0
Williams, Mr. do.	—	0 5 0
Subscriptions under 5s.	—	0 12 0
A Lady.....	1 0 0	—
Newcastle-on-Tyne, per W. C. Walters, Esq.	3 0 0	—
Donations.....	1 5 6	—

We trust that this example will not have been set in vain, but that we shall soon have to record that it has been

followed with spirit by the Clergy and Laity of other parishes.

SOCIETY FOR THE ENLARGEMENT AND BUILDING OF CHURCHES.

THE Seventh Annual Meeting of this Society took place on Wednesday, April 25, at the Freemasons' Tavern. —Present His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury; the Bishops of London, Hereford, Bath and Wells, Chester, Down and Connor, and several other Dignitaries of the Church; Lord Kenyon, Sir R. Peel, G. Gipps, Esq. M.P. William Cotton, and S. Hoare, Esqrs., &c. &c.

At twelve o'clock his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury took the Chair.

The Secretary then read the Report of the proceedings of the Society during the past year. It appeared that applications had been made during that time for assistance, and that in 79 of them grants had been made to the amount of 14,745*l.* and additional accommodation thereby procured for

21,745 persons, of which number 15,253 will be free sittings. Since the first formation of the Society the whole of the applications had been 656, and though 395 of these grants had been made at an expenditure, including what has been already paid, as well as what the Society stands pledged for, of 86,140*l.*, a great impulse had, by these means, been given to the liberality of the inhabitants of parishes; the grant of 1, 3, or 500 pounds, and, in a few instances, of 1000 pounds, stimulated them to the expenditure of three or four times the amount of the donations of the Society; and even in some instances that liberal feeling had gone so far as to supply the sum wanted without the assistance of the Society, although it had actually voted a grant for that purpose. The result of the whole had been an increase of accommodation in 395 Churches and Chapels, to the extent of 113,714 sittings, of which 84,548 were for the sole use of the poor. Great, however, as the benefits had been which the labours of the Society had been enabled to confer, still the rapidly-increasing population rendered further accommodation to a much greater extent still necessary, and the Committee had been compelled to refuse innumerable applications, from want of funds. Many might suppose that this Society was not necessary, and that the Parliamentary grant had provided for all such demands; but it ought to be known that those grants are exclusively appropriated to the building of new Churches in places where the population exceeds 4000 persons, but the present Society gives relief to every parish, be it more or less populous, for the re-building, the enlarging, or the repairing, provided such alterations increase the means of accommodation. Supported entirely by voluntary contribution, the Committee of the Society, in announcing that his Majesty, upon being informed of the failure of their resources, had been graciously pleased to order them a donation of 1000 pounds, earnestly hoped that his example would be followed by the friends of the Established Church, and by every one desirous of affording the means of religious in-

struction to those poor persons who are unable to procure, at present, the necessary accommodation in our places of worship.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in moving that the Report be printed, took occasion to expatiate upon the advantages derived from the exertions of this society, and expressed his confidence, that when the basis of public good on which they stood was thoroughly perceived, that they would have the support of the country at large, as surely as they had, he was convinced, the good wishes of those he had the pleasure of addressing.

The Bishop of London, after the statement of the gracious act of his Majesty in bestowing 1000*l.* to promote the objects of the Society, thought that it should be their first duty to express their sense of the honour conferred upon them from that high quarter; and he had therefore great pleasure in moving a resolution, expressive of the humble gratitude of the Society for the munificent donation which it had been his Majesty's pleasure to bestow upon them. The Right Rev. Prelate observed that this was not the first instance of his Majesty's care of the interests of the Church; there having been a number of legislative enactments for building Churches at the expense of the country, brought forth under the same gracious auspices, and in furtherance of the same purpose. He thought it flattering to the Society that their exertions had been appreciated by his Majesty, and hoped that his Majesty's conduct would operate as a stimulus to induce others to come forward now and supply former deficiencies. The Right Rev. Prelate concluded by observing that the Society had just become known, that its benefits were just about to be understood, and he hoped the Society would, by the donations of the public, be enabled to grant assistance to some of the present numerous applicants.

Sir R. Peel, in seconding the Resolution, said he had an opportunity of witnessing the beneficial effects of the assistance rendered by the Society. They had granted money to him as an assistance for the erection of two gal-

leries in a country Church, and he had the gratification of seeing those galleries filled by persons who were formerly the pests of society, but who had, the moment they possessed places they could call their own, regularly attended divine service, and become respectable members of the community; indeed he was convinced that if the Society continued its efforts, the time would come when they might do without locks to their houses. He had attended the Meeting, although in weak health, to express his sense of the benefits to be derived from perseverance in the course they were pursuing, and to express his desire to double his subscription, because he thought he could not benefit his family more than by promoting the good objects of the Society.

The resolution of thanks to his Majesty was then carried unanimously.

Lord Kenyon, in proposing a vote of thanks to the most Rev. Prelate in the chair, took occasion to pronounce a very animated eulogium on the character of that distinguished person, and to express the high sense which the Society must entertain of his unwearied exertions to promote objects of religion and virtue in general, and more particularly of his zealous co-operation with their Committee in advancing the interests of that Institution.

G. Gipps, Esq. M. P. seconded the resolution. Nothing, he thought, could describe better the advantages of the Institution than the statement of the worthy Baronet with regard to the manufacturing district in which he resided; and he was quite convinced that if their object was to promote the worship of their Creator, by attending to the observance of the Sabbath, they could not do it more effectually than by assisting the efforts of that Society.

The resolution of thanks to the Archbishop of Canterbury was then carried by acclamation.

His Grace briefly returned thanks.

The Bishop of Down and Connor considered it important that they should testify their gratitude to those gentlemen who devoted their services to the Society in the Committee, and who were, from their high station in life, best calculated to promote its inter-

ests, and carry its designs into efficient execution. The Right Reverend Prelate concluded by moving a resolution expressive of the gratitude of the Society to the Treasurer and Gentlemen composing the Committee.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells seconded the resolution. It was unnecessary for him to speak of gentlemen so well known on this occasion as well as others; the Society under their auspices had done great good upon scanty means. It had his wishes, feelings, and prayers for its success.

Sir Inglish Dolben said a few words, but in so low a tone that we were unable to collect his meaning.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Lord Kenyon in returning thanks in behalf of the Committee, informed the meeting, that his worthy friend, Sir Robert Peel had just contributed a third donation of 500*l*.

The Bishop of Chester, in rising to propose a vote of thanks to the person whose former exertions have mainly contributed to the foundation of this Society, and whose continued favours and assistance since, have so materially tended to the promotion of its objects, said—I hope I may not be considered as trespassing too much upon the indulgence of the meeting, if I take the liberty of prefacing that motion by one or two observations. I feel, indeed, that there cannot be any great impropriety in adding my humble testimony to what you have already heard of the great benefits derived from the exertions of this Society in the diocese to which I have more immediately the honour to belong; and in the name of its great and rapidly-increasing population, now anxiously looking forward to the continuance of your assistance, to call upon you not to relax your efforts for procuring them the means of obtaining that religious instruction they so anxiously desire; for however considerable I may be inclined to think the good we have already effected—however great the benefits we have conferred upon the poorer classes of Society—however much we may have aided the propagation of religious truths—I cannot but feel that all we have already done is, if I might use the

expression, but as a nucleus of future exertion—a groundwork for the formation of a Society which may, more than any other, diffuse the light and life of the Gospel, and protect the interests of our Apostolic Church—interests, upon the preservation of which our happiness and prosperity mainly depend. We all know with what difficulty, and after how much entreaty, a sum was obtained from the Legislature, labouring at that time it is true, under the pressure of importunities, from wants supposed to be much greater than ours; but we all recollect the difficulty of obtaining a sum to build churches under certain regulations; the great boon was here justly supposed to have been received when that sum was granted, and yet highly as I am disposed to estimate the advantages derived from that grant—it was, as compared with our actual necessities, but a drop of water in the ocean, and in my opinion will not operate half so much, either in the way of example to the liberal, or actual benefit to the nation at large, as the influence and labour of this Society may be able to accomplish. I know and I speak it from my own experience and observation, that we can as yet hardly calculate upon the good which may be derived from our efforts; the great mass of the population are just beginning to be aware of our existence—only now alive to any just conception of the value of our assistance; this then is the time for renewed and vigorous action—this is the time for the friends of the Church to show their desire to promote the interests of its establishments, for I say that they are answerable for the consequences if they suffer an institution so important to its well-being to die away from a want of their protection, at the very moment too when they had fostered it into vigorous life, and warmed and animated it to a power of beneficial exertion.—Be it remembered, that although you may by the most liberal benefactions encourage the propagation of the Gospel—though you distribute your Bibles through every corner of the kingdom, you have not done all that is required from you—you must provide a place where the people may have the word of God explained by his ministers; and

where they may receive such instructions in the meaning of the Holy Writ, as without which, I fear even the language of that sacred volume may be perverted, and brought to bear an interpretation to their understandings, far different from that which was intended by its inspired authority.—I am happy to say that in my own diocese, wherever accommodation has been provided, the seats have been, in every instance, immediately occupied; and I can bear testimony, from personal observation, to the truth of what has been stated by the worthy and liberal-minded baronet (Sir R. Peel) relative to the visible improvement in the moral condition of the people, wherever they have been thus enabled to benefit by religious instruction. It becomes therefore a sacred duty upon all the well-wishers of pure religion, to extend the influence of a Society which produces so many means of diffusing the true Word of God, and which purposes to afford accommodation, in proper places of worship, to those who, from their inability to procure spiritual assistance in our own Churches, have been—it cannot give surprise to say—been compelled to go elsewhere; and from finding their efforts checked by want of Christian liberty with us, allowed their feelings to take an opposite direction. I hope I am not going beyond the due bounds of propriety; but I would inculcate, and I know from experience its value, the necessity of personal exertion; not alone the mere giving of your own benefaction, but the stimulating others to do so likewise: for I believe there is no Institution, however great its claims upon public generosity, of which it may not be said that every man who gave might have induced another to give something too: and I put it therefore to the conscience of every Subscriber, whether he has it not in his power to induce one other person to contribute his mite along with him. I feel I have already trespassed too long upon your attention, and I therefore beg to move that the thanks of this meeting be given to the Honorary Secretary, for his unceasing labours to promote the interests of the Society.

Mr. Benson seconded the Resolution.

Dr. Shepherd begged to inform the Meeting, that a Society had been formed in the city, to co-operate with that he had now the honour to address, and that it met every Friday in Merchant Seaman's Office in the Royal Exchange, to receive subscriptions, and give information on the subject of the purposes to which the funds were to be applied. The gentlemen of the city thought as they, by the extension of commerce, were instrumental to the increase of the population, they should do something to supply its wants in religious instruction, and they had therefore formed this sub-committee for promoting the same objects. He (Dr. Shepherd) however, mentioned it principally for the purpose of throwing out a suggestion, that a something of the same kind, sitting weekly, might produce beneficial effects in the west end, as well as the east of the metropolis.

The Bishop of Chester informed the Meeting that the City Committee had already raised upwards of 600*l*.

The Resolution of thanks to the Secretary was then carried.

Sir Robert Peel proposed a vote of thanks to the Auditors, expressing a hope that they would continue to hold their offices.

It was seconded and carried.

The Secretary then read the list of subscriptions and donations for the present year. His Majesty 1000*l*.; the Princess Augusta 100*l*.; the Archbishop of Canterbury (third donation) 200*l*.; the Bishop of London (third donation) 200*l*.; Bishop of Worcester 100*l*.; Bishop of Lincoln 100*l*.; Bishop of Bath and Wells 100*l*.; Bishop of Exeter 100*l*.; Bishop of Gloucester

25*l*.; Bishop of Chester (third donation) 50*l*.; Bishop of Lichfield 50*l*.; Sir Robert Peel 500*l*.; Lord Kenyon (third donation) 100*l*.; the Master of Clare Hall, 100*l*.; Mr. Joshua Watson 100*l*.; the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Turnour 21 guineas; Mr. Gipps (third donation) 100*l*. Subscribed in the city, the Lord Bishop of Chester in the chair: the Lord Mayor 30 guineas; Sir R. Wigram (second donation) 100 guineas; the Bishop of Chester 50*l*.; Mr. Foulis 100*l*.; Alderman Thompson 20 guineas.

Mr. Wm. Cotton, the Bank Director, then addressed a few words to the meeting, expressive of his sense of the importance of the Society, and of the lustre conferred upon the character of the Clergy by the support of such institutions.

The Lord Bishop of Hereford apologised for the absence of the Archbishop of York, and expressed his conviction of his Grace's anxious desire to promote the views of the Society.

Thanks were voted to the City Committee for their valuable services.

The Bishop of Chester, from an experience of some years, thought he could assert that the benevolent spirit of the city only required to be awakened, and it would produce the best effects.

The Bishop of Exeter took the liberty of stating that he had lately consecrated a Church in his diocese which was capable of containing 15,000 or 16,000 persons, one half of the expense of which building had been defrayed by a single individual (Lord Rolle.)

The meeting then separated.

UNIVERSITY AND CLERICAL INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

Degrees conferred April 28.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Buttenshaw, Rev. Francis, University College.

Campbell, John, Balliol College.

Dibdin, Rev. Thomas Frognall, St. John's College, Grand Compounder

King, James, Oriel College.

Saint, Rev. John James, Brasenose College.

Urquhart, Rev. Henry John, Fellow of New College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Abbott, Charles, Christ Church.

Alexander, Daniel, St. Mary Hall.

Atwood, Thomas George Patrick, Pembroke College.
 Baldwin, Frederick H. Leger, Queen's College.
 Barnston, Roger St. Worcester College.
 Bayly, Edmund Goodenough, and Brown, Sylvanus, Pembroke College.
 Moore, Arthur, University College.
 Scarbrough, William, Christ Church.

May 5.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Harrison, Rev. John Henry, Wadham College.
 Monypeny, Rev. James Isaac, Wadham College.
 Perkins, Frederick David, Brasenose College.
 Pusey, Edward Bouverie, Oriel College.
 Tiddeman, Richard Philip Goldsworthy, Magdalen Hall.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Baker, George, Wadham College.
 Beddoes, Thomas Lovell, Pembroke College, Grand Compounder.
 Benson, John Peter, Exeter College.
 Bowen, Jeremiah, All Souls' College.
 Capper, John Lewis, Pembroke College.
 Coleridge, Edwin Ellis, Trinity College.
 Colling, Thomas Adams, Lincoln College.
 Cornish, Hubert Kestell, Corpus Christi College.
 Cox, William Hayward, Pembroke College.
 Daubuz, John, Exeter College.
 Dod, Henry Hayman, Worcester College.
 Eyre, George Edward, Oriel College.
 Fell, Samuel Iston, Queen's College.
 Fletcher, Leonard, All Souls' College.
 Fyler, Samuel Arnot, Trinity College.
 Gilpin, Charles, Magdalen Hall.
 Gomonde, William Henry, Queen's College.
 Gregory, Charles, Wadham College.
 Griffith, Thomas Gilbert, Magdalen Hall.
 Hay, George F. Balliol College.
 Meade, Thomas Percy, Brasenose College.
 Morgan, Charles Augustus Samuel, and York, Edward, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.

May 13.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Thirkill, John, Fellow of Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Escott, Bickham Sweet, Christ Church.
 Lloyd, William Henry Cynric, Jesus College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Brook, Mourant, St. Mary Hall.
 Carey, Peter Stafford, St. John's College.

Heborden, William, Oriel College.
 Hewitt, Richard, Queen's College.
 Hone, Frederick Joseph, University College.
 Huddleston, George James, Merton College.
 Hughes, Thomas, Jesus College.
 Hull, Henry William, Oriel College.
 Ind, James, Queen's College.
 Legge, Henry, Christ Church.
 Marshall, John, Worcester College.
 Moss, Joseph William, Magdalen Hall.
 Sydenham, John Philip, Exeter College.

May 21.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Wilkinson, Rev. Marlow Watts, Worcester College.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Barber, Ambrose, Wadham College.
 Battiscombe, William, Pembroke College.
 Currie, Edmund, Wadham College.
 Roberts, Rev. Robert Lloyd Anwyl, Jesus College.
 Stevens, Rev. Henry, and Woodcock, Elborough, Oriel College, Grand Compounder.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Champion, Richard Charles, Magdalen College, Grand Compounder.
 Handley, Augustus Bernard, Queen's College.
 Harrison, Henry Robert, and Harrison, George, Lincoln College.
 Leicester, Frederick, Queen's College.
 Magan, Charles Henry, St. John's College.
 Markham, John, and Markham, William Rice, Christ Church.
 Pountney, Humphrey, Queen's College.
 Priestley, John, Trinity College.
 Rhoades, James Peter, Wadham College.
 Rogers, Aaron, Jesus College.
 Scott, Matthew Robert, Exeter College.
 Stephens, Charles Loder, St. Mary Hall.
 Titley, Peter, Jesus College.

May 25.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Baumgarten, Rev. Charles Henry Thomas, Magdalen Hall.
 Bullock, Edward, Christ Church.
 Cheales, John, Brasenose College.
 Commeline, Rev. Thomas, St. Alban Hall.
 Dawes, Rev. John Henry, St. Edmund Hall.
 Elliott, George Percy, St. Mary Hall.
 Elton, Edward, Brasenose College.
 Escott, Rev. Thomas Sweet, Lincoln College.
 Evans, Rev. Thomas Simpson, St. Alban Hall.

Gresley, William, Student of Christ Church.
 Harding, Rev. John, Balliol College.
 Herbert, Rev. John, Wadham College, Grand Compounder.
 Holt, Rev. Thomas Burbank, Queen's College.
 Home, Rev. William Archibald, Student of Christ Church.
 Huyshe, John, Brasenose College.
 Jones, Rev. Edward, Jesus College.
 Mends, Rev. Joseph, and
 Mendham, Rev. John, St. Edmund Hall.
 Mure, Philip William, Christ Church.
 Pare, Frederick Harry, Christ Church.
 Pennefather, Joseph Lysaght, St. Alban Hall.
 Rowlandson, Arthur, Brasenose College.
 Sandford, Daniel Keyte, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.
 Saunders, Rev. Augustus Page, Student of Christ Church.
 Ward, Rev. Charles Richard, Magdalen Hall.
 Wood, John, Christ Church.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Badnall, William, Brasenose College.
 Bourne, John Gervas Hutchinson, Pembroke College.
 Cooper, Philip Arden, Oriel College.
 Dear, William Smith, Wadham College.
 Ellis, William May, Christ Church.
 Estcourt, Edmund Hilley, Balliol College.
 Fowle, Henry, University College.
 Graham, Francis James, Queen's College.
 Hamilton, William, Pembroke College.
 Hayward, John Curtis, Oriel College.
 Jones, Calvert Richard, Oriel College.
 Justice, John, Christ Church.
 Pruett, Henry, Oriel College.
 Lloyd, Thomas, Jesus College.
 Maybery, Charles, Jesus College.
 North, John, Brasenose College.
 Odell, John, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.
 Palmer, Samuel Sambore, Exeter College, Grand Compounder.
 Parry, James Patrick, Exeter College.
 Sanders, Robert, Magdalen Hall.
 Sergison, William, Brasenose College.
 Smith, George Gordon, St. Alban Hall.
 Shuckburgh, Charles Verney, Trinity College.
 Taylor, John, Brasenose College.
 Toller, Samuel Bush, Trinity College.
 Tompson, Edward Henry, Magdalen Hall.
 Trevenen, Thomas John, Exeter College.
 Tucker, Manwood, Scholar of Balliol College.
 Turner, Charles Hampden, Christ Church.

Usmar, Thomas, Queen's College.
 Vaughan, Hugh, Jesus College.
 Wall, William Ellis, Trinity College.
 Winterbottom, James Edward, and
 Woods, William Leyland, St. John's College.

April 19.

The Rev. William Vaux, M.A. late Fellow of Balliol College, was elected, by the Heads of Colleges, to preach Canon Bampton's Divinity Lecture for the year 1826.

April 27.

Mr. William Street Escott was admitted Scholar of New College.

April 28.

The Rev. Edward Cardwell, B.D. Fellow of Brasenose College, was approved in Convocation as an Examining Master in "*Literis Humanioribus*."

[An election of King's Scholars at Westminster School took place this day, when the following young gentlemen were elected, by which they are entitled either to Studentships of Christ Church, Oxford, or Scholarships of Trinity College, Cambridge:—Messrs. Woodfall, Heathcote, Downes, Sutherland, Brodie, Gwilt, Simpson, and M^rLevey.]

May 5.

Mr. Jacobson, of Edmund Hall, and Messrs. Quaruby, Pymont, Metcalfe, and Jackson, Commoners of Lincoln College, were elected Scholars of that Society.

In full Convocation this day, the University Seal was affixed to a letter of thanks from the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars, to the very Rev. the Dean of Westminster, for his late munificent foundation of four University Scholarships.

May 11.

The University Seal was affixed to a Deed of Foundation of a Professorship in Political Economy, on the endowment of Henry Drummond, Esq. of Albany Park, in the county of Surry. The Professor is to be elected by Convocation, and to hold the Professorship for the space of five years, being capable of re-election after the lapse of two years. He is to read a course of nine lectures at the least during one of the four academical Terms in every year, and to print and publish one of the same lectures. Three persons are to be considered as forming a class, and if the Professor neglects so to read or to publish, according to the intention of the founder,

he forfeits all claim to the salary attached to the Professorship during the period of such neglect.

May 12.

Mr. Charles Richard Littledale, Mr. Marmaduke Robert Jeffreys, Mr. George Phillimore, and Mr. Charles Otway Mayne, were admitted Students of Christ Church, from Westminster School.

May 25.

Being the first day of Trinity or Act Term, the following Gentlemen were nominated Masters of the Schools:—

Rev. James Thomas Round, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

Rev. Charles Dodgson, M.A. Student of Christ Church.

Rev. Llewelyn Lewellin, M.A. Scholar of Jesus College.

CAMBRIDGE.

Degrees conferred April 27.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Dawson, Rev. Francis, Trinity College.

HONORARY MASTER OF ARTS.

Sandys, Sir Windsor Edwin Bayntun, Trinity College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Blake, Walter,

Bower, George Henry, and

Fry, John, Trinity College.

Gibbons, George, Sidney College, Grand Compounder.

Stone, William, St. Peter's College.

Wallington, Charles, Christ College.

May 4.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Calvert, Nicholson Robert, St. John's College.

Gorton, Robert, Jesus College, Grand Compounder.

Wood, Rev. Richard, Corpus Christi College.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Seymour, Henry Caen, Trinity Hall.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Bally, William Ford, Downing College.

Carpendale, William, St. John's College.

Townsend, Samuel Thomas, Trinity College.

Vyvyan, Vyell F. Trinity College.

May 16.

MASTER OF ARTS.

Holmes, Rev. Frederick, B.A. of St. John's College, by Royal Mandate.

May 11.

MASTER OF ARTS.

Holditch, Rev. Hamnett, Caius College.

Holmes, D. St. John's College, by Royal Mandate.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Moxon, Rev. Daniel Richard Leake Catharine Hall.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Blunt, Rev. Walter, Fellow of King's College.

Townsend, George Osborne, Fellow of King's College.

West, Rev. Thomas, Christ College.

May 25.

DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Frere, William, Esq. Master of Downing College, and Serjeant at Law. By Royal Mandate.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Dudding, Rev. Barr, Catharine Hall. Whitaker, Rev. Thomas Wright, Emmanuel College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Deedes, John, Trinity College.

Freer, John Lane, Trinity College.

Hurnall, John, Emmanuel College.

Osborne, Frederick, Trinity Hall.

Quintin, George Darby St. Trinity College.

Stevenson, Charles Butler, Emmanuel College.

May 11.

The following Grace passed the Senate:—

To appoint the Rev. Dr. Wait, of St. John's College, to make a descriptive catalogue of the Oriental MSS. in the University Library.

May 16.

Thomas Grainger Hall, B.A. and the Rev. W. Waring, B.A. of Magdalen College, were elected Foundation Fellows, and Samuel Wilks Waud, B.A. a Wray Fellow of that Society.

May 18.

George Burrows, Esq. B.A. of Caius College, was elected Fellow of that Society.

Mr. Philip W. Buckham, of St. John's College, is elected Hebrew Scholar on the late Mr. Tyrwhitt's foundation.

May 25.

At a Congregation this day, the following Gentlemen were admitted *ad eundem*.

Rev. John Russell, D.D. Head Master of Charter House School.

Rev. Wm. Hale Hale, M.A. Preacher at the Charter House.

William Parry Richards, M.A.

The Hon. George Allen Brodrick, son

of Viscount Middleton, is admitted of St. John's College.

PREFERMENTS.

The King has been pleased to order a congé d'elire to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, empowering them to elect a Bishop of that See, the same being void by the death of Dr. John Fisher, late Bishop thereof; and his Majesty has also been pleased to recommend to the said Dean and Chapter, the Right Rev. Father in God Dr. THOMAS BURGESS, Lord Bishop of St. DAVID's, to be by them elected Bishop of the said See of SALISBURY.

Barter, William, M.A. and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, to the Livings of Burghclere and Newton; Patron, the Earl of Carnarvon.

Beckwith, E. G. A. M.A. to a Minor Canonry in the Church of St. Peter; Patron, the very Rev. the Dean of Westminster.

Butt, John William, M.A. Vicar of Lakenheath, Suffolk, to the Rectory of Southery, Norfolk; Patron, Robert Martin, Esq.

Carey, William Sherlock, M.A. and Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Ashburton, Devon.

Champnes Charles, B.A. of St. Alban Hall, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Botolph, Billingsgate, with the Rectory of St. George, Botolph-lane; Patron, the King.

Clarkson, Townley, M.A. to the Rectory of Acton Scott, Salop; Patroness, Mrs. Stockhouse.

Coke, G. M.A. Rector of Aylton, to the Livings of Marston and Pencoed, Herefordshire; Patron, Rev. F. Coke, Vicar of Sellack.

Dixon, Thomas, B.A. of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Tibbenham, Norfolk; Patron, the Bishop of Ely.

Elwin, R. P. to the Rectory of St. Margaret of Westwick, Norwich; Patron, the King.

Greaves, Henry Addington, B.A. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Classical Assistant at Oakham School, to the Head Mastership of the Devonport Classical and Mathematical School.

Grenside, Ralph, B.A. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to the Perpetual Curacy of Seamer, Yorkshire; Patron, R. G. Russell, Esq. M.P.

Guy, Thomas, M.A. Master of the Gram-

mar School, Howden, to the Vicarage of Howden; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Haggitt, D'Arcy, M.A. to the Vicarage of St. Andrew, Pershore, with the Chapels of Holy Cross, Besford, Defford, Bricklehampton, and Pinvin, annexed, Worcestershire; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster.

Hewson, W. Vicar of Swansea, to be Chancellor and Canon Residentiary of the Cathedral Church of St. David's.

Hutchins, James, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of Telscomb and Vicarage of Piddlinghoe, in the Diocese of Chichester.

Johnson, Richard, M.A. Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Lavenham, Suffolk; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

Mackreth, T. to the Rectory of Halton, near Manchester.

Melluish, T. A. to the Rectory of St. Mary Steps, Exeter.

Morgan, Henry, B.C.L. to the Perpetual Curacy of Withington, Salop.

Parker, Edwin J. M.A. and Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, to be Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Braybrooke.

Pattison, M. J. M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Hawkswell, Yorkshire; Patron, Mrs. Gail.

Phillips, Thomas, D.D. of Queen's College, Cambridge, to be Head Master of the Royal Grammar and District Schools in Upper Canada.

Pilkington, Charles, M.A. of Magdalen College, Oxford, to a Prebendal Stall in Chichester Cathedral.

Roberts, T. G. Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, and Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Leitrim, to the Rectory of Dolgellau, in the county of Merioneth; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Roby, John, Rector of Congerston, Leicestershire, and Chaplain to Earl Howe, to the Vicarage of Anstrey, Warwickshire; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Sergeant, O. to the Ministry of St. Philip's, Salford.

Shaw, E. B. to the Ministry of St. Matthew's Manchester.

Tanner, W. to the Rectories of Bolnhurst and Colnworth, Bedfordshire.

Timbrill, John, D.D. of Worcester College, Oxford, to the Archdeaconry of Gloucester, with the Rectory of Dursley annexed.

Twigg, William, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Pickhall,

Yorkshire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of the above Society.

CLERGYMEN MARRIED.

- Best, Nathaniel, B.A. of Balliol College, Oxford, youngest son of George Best, Esq. of Bayfield Hall, Norfolk, to Mary, eldest daughter of Eardley Wilmot Mitchell, Esq. of Wargroves, Sussex.
- Boykett, T. of Enderby, Lincolnshire, to Hannah Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late William King, Esq. of Woodstreet, Cheapside.
- Bray, Bidlake, son of Colonel Bray, to Saba Eliza Malkin, only daughter of the late Major Malkin.
- Brooksbank, Edward H. Vicar of Tickhill, Yorkshire, to Hannah, daughter of the late B. Heywood, Esq. of Stanley Hall.
- Browning, Frederick, M.A. of King's College, Cambridge, Rector of Tichwell, Norfolk, and Prebendary of Salisbury, to Wilhelmina, eldest daughter of Sir William Earle Welby, Bart. of Denton Hall.
- Burton, Edward, M.A. and Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to Helen, second daughter of Archdeacon Corbett, of Longnor Hall.
- Cattermole, Richard, to Maria Frances, eldest daughter of George Giles, Esq. of Enfield.
- Cooper, J. K. to Miss E. A. Whately; at Isleworth.
- Coote, Ralph, to Harriet, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Samuel Clore, of Elm Park, county of Armagh.
- Evans, David D. of Carmarthen, to Sarah, youngest daughter of the late George Conway, Esq. of Pontnewydd Works, Monmouthshire.
- Goggs, H. Vicar of South Creak, Norfolk, to Mary, youngest daughter of Captain Coley, of Mile-end.
- Hale, Richard, Vicar of Harewood, and Rector of Goldsbrough, to Mary Anne, eldest daughter of John Loft, Esq. of Stainton House.
- Holmes, T. P. to Miss Marriott, only daughter of Mr. Marriott, of Wisbech.
- Leir, Paul, Rector of Charlton Musgrove, Somersetshire, to Fanny, widow of W. Morton Pleydell, Esq.
- Master, James Streynsham, to Alice, fifth daughter of Samuel Horrocks, Esq. M.P.
- Mitchell, Thomas Penruddocke, of Histon, Cambridgeshire, to Caroline Patience, third daughter of the Rev. G. Wyld, of Speen, Berks.

Molyneux, Geo. More, Rector of Compton, Surrey, to Ann Spurstow, daughter of William Skrine, Esq. of Montague-square, London; at Mary-le-bone Church.

Norris, G. B. to Miss Susan Marsinghall, both of Taunton.

Poole, R. jun. B.A. of Ripon, Yorkshire, to Anne, daughter of H. Tennant, Esq. of Kirk Hammerton, Yorkshire.

Poulter, Brownlow, M.A. Rector of Buriton, Hants, and late of Trinity College, Cambridge, to Harriett, youngest daughter of the late James Morley, Esq. formerly of Kemp-shot, Hants, and Member of the Council of Bombay.

Roberts, J. R. B.D. Rector of Rotherfield Greys, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, to Mrs. Ashton, of Mecklenburgh-square; on Friday, May 27, at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, by the Rev. W. J. G. Phillips, Vicar of Eling, Hants.

Sadler, James Hayes, to Miss Rich, niece of the late Mrs. General Jones; at Cheltenham.

Savage, James Anthony, B.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, to Margaret, youngest daughter of Thomas Brooke, Esq. of Widcombe Crescent, Bath.

Shepherd, Richard, Vicar of Rudbury, Yorkshire, to Ann, daughter of Robert Bingham, Esq. of that place.

Turnour, Hon. and Rev. E. John, M.A. Secretary of the Clergy Orphan Society, to Rebecca, eldest daughter of the late Rev. David Jones, of Long Hope, Gloucestershire; at Newington Church, Surrey.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

On Sunday, May 8, at his house in Seymour-street, London, aged 76, JOHN LORD BISHOP of SALISBURY, Chancellor of the Order of the Garter; the eldest of nine sons of a former Vicar of Peterborough. His Lordship rose from a Fellowship of St. John's College, Cambridge, to be successively Tutor to the Duke of Kent, Canon of Windsor, Bishop of Exeter, then of Sarum, and Preceptor to the late Princess Charlotte of Wales. He enjoyed for many years the distinguishing confidence of his late Majesty.

Bathie, George, of Hammersmith, aged 67.

Berkeley, Joshua, Rector of the Parish of the Holy Trinity, Cork.

Bradley, W. S. Prebendary of Wells, Vi-

ear of Chard and of Limberscombe, Somersetshire; at Minehead, aged 56.
 Butler, Thomas, Rector of Bentham and Whittington, in his 90th year.
 Clayton, John, at Eversham.
 Collier, John, M.A. Perpetual Curate of Tilstock; at Whitechurch.
 Gerrans, Benjamin, at Prospect-place, Walworth, at an advanced age.
 Gibbs, Lawrence, M.A. in the 85th year of his age, Rector of Brockdish, Norfolk, and of Cainby, Lincolnshire.
 Gurney, R. Vicar of Tregony and St. Paul, Cornwall.
 Hawkins, J. Brown, of an apoplectic fit, aged 28.
 Kitson, J. L. Vicar of Stiverton, and Ashburton, Devon.
 Norris, William, at Hindon, Wilts, in the 78th year of his age.
 Powys, Henry, of Stoke Golding, Leicestershire, in his 34th year.
 Ralfe, William, at Mauldon Rectory, Bedfordshire.
 Rivett, Thomas, at Everton, aged 70.
 Sherson, A. K. P. at Buntingford, aged 55.
 Smith, Joseph, Rector of Hutton, in his 50th year.

Stephenson, John Wilkinson, M.A. on the Old Foundation of Queen's College, Oxford.
 Vivian, Richard, many years Rector of Bushey Herts, and uncle to Major-General Sir Hussey Vivian, one of the Equerries in Waiting to his Majesty. The Rev. Gentleman left home early in the morning, to transact some important business with the Bishop of London, and in passing through the Strand, suddenly fell to the ground, and was heard to groan only once ere life was extinct. Mr. V. was formerly a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and took the degree of M.A. in 1778, and of B.D. in 1789. In 1797 he was appointed to the Rectory of Bushey, in the county of Herts, which Living is in the gift of the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College, and was Proctor in the year 1787. Mr. V. was in the 72d year of his age, and has left a family of six children.
 Williamson, T. of the Groves, Chelsea.
 Woodroffe, W. H. Vicar of Swincomb, Oxfordshire.

MONTHLY LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

DIVINITY.

Sermons on various Subjects. By the late Rev. Thomas Rennell, B.D. 8vo. 12s.

Supplement to the Protestant's Companion; containing, amongst other Subjects in discussion, a particular Analysis of Bishop Baines's novel Doctrine of Transubstantiation. By the Rev. Charles Daubeny, LL.D. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Sermons on various Subjects; with an Appendix, containing an Examination of certain supposed Points of Analogy between Baptism and Circumcision. By the Rev. John Edward Nassau Molesworth, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Six Sermons, preached in the Church of the Holy Trinity at Cheltenham,

during the season of Easter. By J. W. Cunningham, A.M. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism. By the Rev. Joseph Bianco White, M.A. and B.D. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

Sermons on various Subjects. By the Rev. John Hewlett, B.D. Vol. 4. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Idolatry the prevailing Practice of the Church of Rome; or, an Appeal from Testimony to Facts, in a Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. By the Rev. W. Borradaile, M.A. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A Manual of Family Devotions; containing a Form of Prayer for every Morning and Evening in the Week, &c. By the Rev. Thomas Stevenson, M.A. 12mo.

A Collection of Passages from the Holy Bible, which combat the Errors of the Church of Rome; with a Preface, on the Claims of the Catholics. 8vo. 1s.

St. Paul's Visitation at Miletus; a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary Tower, Ipswich. By the Rev. John Wilcox, M.A. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Six Lectures on Popery, delivered in King-street Chapel, Maidstone, by William Groser. 12mo. 5s.

The Social Conduct of a Christian considered, in seven Sermons, addressed to an Individual. 12mo. 2s.

Aids to Reflection, in a Series of Prudential, Moral, and Spiritual Aphorisms, extracted chiefly from the Works

of Archbishop Leighton. By S. T. Coleridge. small 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Fifth Volume of the Village Preacher, a Collection of short, plain Sermons, partly original, partly selected, and adapted to Village Instruction. 12mo. 5s.

The Village Pastor; consisting of a Series of Essays on Subjects interesting to the Religious World. By one of the Authors of Body and Soul. 12mo. 8s.

The Origin, Progress, and existing Circumstances of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. An Historical Inquiry. By the Rev. H. H. Norris, A.M. 8vo. 12s.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WORKS IN THE PRESS.

The Rev. James Richardson, A.M. of Queen's College, Oxford, has in the press, in one volume 8vo. A Full Answer to the Rev. J. Baddeley's "Sure Way to find out the True Religion," in which the Misrepresentations of that Author, (especially with respect to our celebrated Martyrologist, John Fox) are detected and exposed.

Mrs. Thompson, Author of the "Family Commentary on the New Testament," is preparing for publication, A Commentary on the Psalms.

A Paraphrase of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes. By the Rev. J. E. Tolley, 1 vol. 8vo. will shortly be published.

A new Edition of the Rev. John

Bird Sumner's Essay on the Records of the Creation, revised and corrected by the Author, will shortly be published.

The Rev. I. T. James, Author of Travels in Russia and Poland, has in the press, the Scepticism of To-day; or, the Common Sense of Religion considered.

A Volume of Sermons, by the Rev. Hugh M'Neill, A.M. Rector of Albury, will appear in the course of a few days.

A Course of Nine Sermons, intended to illustrate some of the leading Truths contained in the Liturgy of the Church of England. By the Rev. F. Close, A.M. Curate of the Holy Trinity Church, Cheltenham.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

It is requested that all future Communications will be directed to the Editor, at Mr. MAWMAN'S, Ludgate-street.